DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 170 833 UD 019 813

AUTHOR von Euler, Mary, Ed.; Lambers, Gail, Ed.
TITLE The Catholic Community and the Integration of Public and Catholic Schools.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Mar 79
CONTRACT NIE-P-78-0034
NOTE 67p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Catholic Schools; Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Secondary Education; *Integration Methods; *Integration Studies; *Minority Groups; *Public Schools; *School Integration
IDENTIFIERS *National Catholic Conference Interracial Justice

ABSTRACT

In the first paper presented here eight problems are addressed: (1) racial inventory of Catholic school students; (2) inventory of integration policies and programs; (3) minority faculty in Catholic schools; (4) desegregation strategy; (5) Catholic schools and public school desegregation; (6) Catholic schools and Hispanic Americans; (7) successful Catholic "magnet" high schools; and (8) the role of inner city Catholic elementary schools. In the second paper, five aspects of the problem minorities have in becoming part of American society while retaining their own identity are examined: (1) culture; (2) the experience of the early Church; (3) the Catholic schools as an integrating force; (4) the dimensions of the challenge to keep minorities in school; and (5) the response to this challenge. The third paper looks at the statement of the Catholic Church on integration, discusses the call to action and the statistics on integration in Catholic schools. It also examines the problem in the context of voluntary attendance and tuition costs, as well as an agenda for integration and the process of implementation. In the fourth paper, an overview of the Diocese of Columbus, Ohio, shows what is possible and what is working in the process of integrating Catholic schools. The fifth paper, "Lessons from Public School Desegregation," examines the impetus for desegregation, the constitutional base, class and a racist society, curriculum, educational quality, voluntarism in both the public schools and the Catholic schools, and research needs. The sixth paper discusses the Cleveland experience and its implications for Catholic schools. The last two contributions summarize the conference discussions. (Author/MC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Catholic Community and the Integration of Public and Catholic Schools

ED170433

March, 1979

Edited by Mary von Euler
and Sr. Gail Lambers, C.H.S.

Papers from a conference sponsored by the
National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice
in cooperation with the
National Catholic Education Association
and the
Department of Education of the United States Catholic Conference
May 1978

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Joseph A. Califano, Jr., Secretary
Mary F. Berry, Assistant Secretary for Education

National Institute of Education
Patricia Albjerg Graham
Director
Marc S. Tucker
Associate Director, Educational Policy and Organization
Robert Schwartz
Assistant Director, Law and Public Management

UD019413

This report was funded by the National Institute of Education under Contract Number NIE-P-78-0034. Its contents do not necessarily reflect the views of the Institute or of any other agency of the United States Government.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402

Foreword

The National Institute of Education is pleased to publish these papers in order to focus national attention on some complex issues which deserve examination by educators, researchers, and policymakers. The papers convey the concern of many Catholic educators about school integration as a moral and educational issue, and they touch upon many related policy issues. For example:

- What is the most constructive role for the Catholic community, as public schools implement desegregation orders?
- How can parochial schools achieve racial integration—not merely by moving bodies, but by integrating curriculum and retraining teachers?

The papers suggest a number of sets of related questions that require research. For example:

- Who precisely are the students and teachers in the parochial school system, school by school, by race and socioeconomic status?
- What are the qualities of parochial schools that families selecting them find attractive?
- Why have Hispanic Catholic schools not developed in recent decades in the same way that parochial schools emerged in the last century to serve Irish and Italian immigrants?
- What particular problems arise from the fact that most blacks enrolled in parochial schools are not Catholic? How have schools differed in their approach to these problems?
- What kinds of student integration and faculty recruitment policies have been tried in the Catholic schools? What are the characteristics of the most successful practices?
- In each city, what has been the effect on the public schools of alternative policies of the Catholic community?

The Institute publishes these papers in the belief that they are stimulating. The views expressed are those of the authors only and are not statements of policy of the Federal government or the National Institute of Education.

Ronald D. Henderson, Leader
Desegregation Studies Team

Marc S. Tucker, Associate Director
Educational Policy and Organization

Table of Contents

Page

Foreword iii

The Racial Integration of Catholic Schools: The State of the Question
Mr. John A. McDermott 1

Catholic Schools and Racial Integration: A Journey into the Future
Rev. Joseph P. Fitzpatrick, S.J. 9

Integration of Catholic Schools: What is Possible? What is Working?
Sr. Frances Flanigan, H.M. 17
Rev. David Sorohan 27

Lessons from Public School Desegregation
Mr. Meyer Weinberg 33

Catholic Schools and Public School Desegregation
Sr. Brigid Griffin, C.S.J. 43

Highlighting the Conference: Discussions, Reflections, Responses
Mrs. Hope Brophy 51

Unfinished Business: School Desegregation
Rev. Msgr. Aloysius J. Welsh, S.T.D. 59

Appendix
Contributors 60
Resource People 61
Attendees 62
Conference Program 64

The Racial Integration of Catholic Schools: The State of the Question

by John A. McDermott

These papers arise from a conference on "Catholic Schools and Racial Integration." It was subtitled a "*Journey into the Future*" because of our conviction at the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice (NCCIJ) that integrating American Catholic schools is an issue which has yet to be faced in all its fullness by Catholic educators, by the hierarchy, and by the American Catholic community. Our conference was a step on that journey, as we came to share and to explore together where we have been, where we are, and where we have to go to fulfill the special mission of Catholic schools on the issue of race.

This is a mission which has special meaning to us as members of the Catholic community because of the values on which our schools have been founded. It is our purpose to teach our children, and the larger community, of which we are a part and which is engaged in a long and honorable struggle, how to become a society of interracial justice and peace.

The United States Catholic Conference (USCC) and the National Catholic Education Association (NCEA) cosponsored the conference with NCCIJ. The participation of USCC and NCEA is solid evidence that our concern for this issue is shared at the very highest leadership levels of the Church.

NCCIJ is the oldest national Catholic organization in the field of human rights. It is a national membership organization of Catholics concerned with the issues of civil rights and racial justice. It grew out of the Catholic Interracial Council movement founded by the late Fr. John La Farge S.J. in New York City in the early 1930's.

NCCIJ is an independent, voluntary organization supported by its members and friends in the Catholic community. Its supporters include many bishops, priests, sisters and religious congregations and institutions as well as laymen. NCCIJ's historic mission has been to witness, to advocate and to work for racial justice in American society with particular attention to the state of race relations in Catholic institutions and in the Catholic community as a whole.

As we look to the task before us, to this journey into the future, we must not forget the contributions of those who have gone before us. The integration of Catholic schools, after all, is not a new issue. We should not forget the leadership of many Southern dioceses that promptly and voluntarily desegregated their school systems following the Supreme Court decision of 1954. We should not forget the heroism, for example, of the late Archbishop Rummel in standing fast against all manner of pressure and personal abuse when he desegregated the New Orleans Catholic schools in the 1950's.

Indeed, for a time 15 or 20 years ago, when school desegregation had primarily a southern setting and when the issue was to end dual school systems that had been segregated by statute, Catholic schools were regarded as models, as leaders showing how to comply with the spirit as well as the letter of the law. The legacy of that leadership is not dead, but it is fair to say that Catholic schools today are no longer regarded as leaders or models of desegregation.

There are several reasons for this change: First, the school integration issue has become much more complicated and demanding than merely ending dual school systems and other forms of overt, *de jure* segregation. The goal of national policy is genuine integration, the integration of every school in every multiracial community. Where there has been deliberate segregation, the remedy is for all schools and classrooms to reflect in some reasonable proportion the racial composition of the community. The plain fact is that while every Catholic school system is officially nondiscriminatory as to race in its admissions policies, we are a long way from racial integration in most Catholic schools and classrooms. Racial integration in Catholic schools serving multiracial communities is still the exception rather than the rule.

School integration today does not mean merely ending what is positively bad, but creating what is positively good. This is much more difficult, and we have yet to create the tools—the research, the techniques and the special services—to help Catholic educators and the Catholic community cope with this new challenge.

Second, in recent years public school desegregation has become a national issue embracing the North as well as the South. It has moved to the northern cities, the great heartland of American Catholicism. The result has been that Catholic schools have found themselves in a reactive posture. Catholic school leaders have been asked, and rightly so, to do what they can to help public school desegregation work. In this process, many Catholic educators have been forced to compare their own policies and programs on school integration with the often elaborate, controversial and prodigious efforts in desegregation and community education which have flowed from court ordered public school desegregation. The results have often been painful and embarrassing.

Today, Catholic school systems, once regarded as leaders, are by and large followers in the cause of school integration. And unfortunately, some Catholic educators seem content to be followers or spectators on this issue. They tend to define racial integration as a "public school issue." We reject and condemn their attitude as unworthy of the Church and the mission of our schools.

For many others, however, I am happy to say this is not so. Like the delegates to our conference, they are concerned not only to do their civic duty to help the public schools but also to do their religious duty to make racial integration a

reality in their own schools.

A third reason for the lack of Catholic leadership on racial integration has been the tremendous internal crisis experienced by the American Church in the 15 years since the Second Vatican Council. Internal problems of belief, personnel, polity and process have so dominated these years as to weaken the concern and energy available for other issues. I do not know whether this internal crisis is over. I do not know what any of us can do about it. I only know that the Christian social agenda, including the issue of race and Catholic schools, will not wait until we get it all worked out. On this, I am sure, we are agreed.

The first task before us is to take stock of our situation. I propose to begin by trying to outline some of the key questions as we see them in NCCIJ. What I will attempt is a kind of research agenda listing eight pertinent problems which must be dealt with if we are to move ahead.

1. Racial Inventory of Catholic School Students

We know that the number of black and Hispanic students in Catholic elementary and secondary schools has increased substantially in the last ten years while total Catholic school enrollment has declined. In Chicago, for example, minority student enrollment in Catholic schools increased 21 percent between 1971 and 1977 while total Catholic school enrollment declined 26 percent during those same years.

Nationally, there has been an increase of about 70,000 black and Hispanic students in Catholic elementary and secondary schools between 1971 and 1977 while the total Catholic school enrollment has declined by about 1,000,000 students. Black and Hispanic students now number 500,000 or about 15 percent of a total national enrollment of about 3,400,000 students in Catholic elementary and high schools.

In summary, while the minority presence in Catholic schools is growing, *we don't know where these students are.* We urgently need **a national racial inventory or headcount of Catholic schools, diocese by diocese, city by city, school by school.** Only in this way can we get a clear view of the real situation. Such an inventory would show the actual extent of integration of Catholic schools. It would permit analysis of the total racial mix in a diocese's or a city's Catholic schools and how this mix is reflected in individual schools.

2. Inventory of Integration Policies and Programs

Similarly, we need **a national inventory of integration policies and programs of Catholic school systems**—a compilation, diocese by diocese, of specific policies and programs which bear on the racial integration of Catholic schools.

3. Minority Faculty in Catholic Schools

We also need **a national inventory of minority faculty in Catholic schools.** To what extent are Catholic school faculties racially integrated?

As part of this inventory we also need **data on minority teacher recruitment policies, programs and performance among Catholic school systems around the country.** Which programs have been most effective in attracting minority teachers into Catholic schools? Which programs have been most effective in placing minority teachers so as to encourage faculty integration?

The sketchy evidence before us now suggests that Catholic schools *are* attractive to minority teachers despite a pay scale which is considerably inferior to that of most public schools. The attractiveness of Catholic schools is related to an environment which is supportive of good teaching, a quality very dear to many harassed public school teachers. The question to explore is, how can we capitalize on the strengths of Catholic schools to recruit more minority teachers?

4. Desegregation Strategy

Catholic schools seem to have some special strengths and weaknesses when it comes to making desegregation work. We need research and model testing on the best experience around the country. Which strategies work best for Catholic schools? How can we maximize the strengths and minimize the weaknesses?

Among Catholic schools' special strengths relative to desegregation are:

- **Value Orientation**—Catholic schools are value teaching institutions. This is their *raison d'être*. They are superably equipped to make integration work by dealing directly with parents and students on the fundamental value questions relating to human dignity and equality which are at the root of interracial justice and reconciliation. They can create a strong sense of unity across racial lines by bringing students and parents together through sharing a common identity formed by important common values and expressed by common symbols, practices and liturgical experiences.
- **Size**—Most Catholic schools are smaller than their public school counterparts. This facilitates the building of a sense of community among parents, faculty and students. It is difficult for a student to be "anonymous" in the typical Catholic school. This setting makes it easier for the principal and faculty to be on top of race relations within the school and to deal quickly with problems before they become serious.
- **Discipline**—Catholic schools have a strong tradition of good discipline based on respect for the authority of the principal and faculty. If all else fails, racist students and parents can be asked to leave the institution. This is another obvious strength in making integration work.
- **Minority presence**—The minority presence in most Catholic school systems is considerably smaller than in counterpart public school systems. The fear of massive racial transition which is often a significant factor in resistance to public school desegregation, therefore, has much less validity in Catholic schools. In the typical Catholic school white parents have much less reason to fear that their children will be in an unstable, racially "abnormal" situation.
- **Power of the Principal**—The Catholic school principal typically has more authority than a public school principal of similar rank. The Catholic school principal usually will have the right to hire and fire faculty and maintenance personnel and will have complete control over the provision of supplies and materials. This means that the Catholic school principal has more power to set a tone of acceptance of racial integration on the part of the school staff.
- **Parental Participation**—As private institutions which parents voluntarily choose for their children and for which privilege they pay tuition,

Catholic schools typically enjoy a stronger spirit of parental involvement and cooperation than public schools. This is another obvious strength in educating and involving parents in programs designed to make racial integration work.

But Catholic schools also have some special disadvantages in effecting desegregation:

- **Financial Crisis**—Catholic school systems have experienced a serious financial crisis over the last ten years caused by a number of factors including a decline in the number of religious faculty, rising operating costs and the demand for higher academic standards. One effect of this crisis has been to push into the background all issues other than survival. Many Catholic educators, looking at the huge expenditures in public school desegregation programs, have become discouraged. They feel that their schools simply cannot "afford" to mount a desegregation program. This applies particularly to cost of transportation. This attitude, however, rests on the assumption that Catholic school desegregation plans must follow precisely the public school model.
- **Voluntariness**—While from one point of view the voluntary character of Catholic schools is an advantage to school desegregation in that it guarantees parental interest, from another point of view it is a disadvantage. Catholic schools cannot *force* parents to participate in a desegregation program. Parents are always free to withdraw their children. While parents can also "withdraw" from public schools in order to avoid integration, the cost of such a decision is usually much higher for public school parents. Typically it involves moving out of the district or paying tuition to a private school.

  The fact is that to be successful, it is essential that Catholic schools win the hearts and minds of their parents regarding racial integration.
- **Decentralization**—Compared to public school systems, Catholic school systems are more federations of independent schools than centralized systems. While there are system-wide academic and personnel standards, all elementary and many high schools are owned and financed by local parish communities. The size of the school and tuition rate varies significantly from school to school. Typically, each elementary school is heavily subsidized by the local parish community. This subsidy is justified by the concept that the primary mission of school is to educate the children of the local parish community.

  This system has some admirable strengths, but it can also create serious complications for system-wide desegregation programs, particularly those which involve pairing or merging parish elementary schools.

This is but a brief overview of some of the peculiarities facing Catholic school desegregation. We need strategies which recognize these realities and try to make the best of them. We need research into what is now underway and a critical evaluation of the effectiveness of various approaches.

More important, because we know that there are relatively few system-wide programs currently in existence, we need experimentation and model testing to learn which approach is best for Catholic schools. Which approach maximizes

the advantages and minimizes the disadvantages which Catholic schools possess in the desegregation process? There are important public policy objectives involved in this research, and I hope we will be able to get some help from the government for this research.

5. Catholic Schools and Public School Desegregation

In many cities around the country the Catholic community, including Catholic school systems, is actively involved in community-wide efforts to support public school desegregation. Catholics are involved in these efforts simply as good citizens, but cooperation on the part of Catholic schools has universally been regarded as crucially important to successful public school desegregation. We are referring here, of course, primarily to cities with large Catholic school systems.

In such cities, white flight from the public schools has been a serious concern. In particular, it is feared that white parents might switch their children to Catholic schools in order to avoid involvement in public school integration. The response on the part of Catholic schools in several cities has been to institute "anti-flight" policies, moratoriums on transfers from the public schools for the period of time during which the public school integration process is underway.

These are praiseworthy programs, but we really know little about their effectiveness. We need an evaluation of the several "anti-flight" programs which have been adopted. What has been their impact on public school desegregation? What has been their impact on Catholic schools? In addition, we need to explore what other actions Catholic schools might undertake to assist in public school desegregation.

6. Catholic Schools and Hispanic-Americans

Since Americans of Latin-American or Hispanic background come from cultures with a strong Catholic tradition, it would be logical to expect Hispanic students to be strongly predominant in Catholic schools. But this is not the case. Although some 25 percent of the American Catholic community is of Hispanic background, only 7.5 percent of the students in Catholic elementary and high schools in 1972 were Hispanic. This is only slightly larger than the percentage of black students in Catholic schools although the black Catholic community is very small.

We need to understand better the reasons for this apparent discrepancy. Why are there not more Hispanic students in Catholic schools? Is it simply a matter of the geographic distribution of the Hispanic population? Is it the cost of Catholic education? Or is it a cultural insensitivity on the part of Catholic schools? How important are bilingual and bicultural educational programs in making Catholic schools more attractive to Hispanics? If we agree that integration of Hispanic students deserves special priority in Catholic schools, what steps should be taken to encourage it?

7. Successful Catholic "Magnet" High Schools

One of the outstanding success stories of racial integration in Catholic schools has been the presence in many American cities of excellent inner city Catholic high schools which still attract white students from all over their metropolitan areas. Typically, these are schools which have become integrated in the last 10 to

15 years as their immediate community changed. Untypically, however, these schools have *not* fled and have *not* lowered their academic standards. I am thinking of such schools as St. Ignatius, De LaSalle and Mt. Carmel in Chicago and St. Joseph's Prep in Philadelphia. There are one or two such schools in almost every big northern city.

These schools do not represent a perfect model of what ought to be done. For example, almost all of them are exclusively boys' schools. But, there are some valuable lessons to be learned from the experience of these schools. We need an evaluation of their experiences and their programs.

8. Role of Inner City Catholic Elementary Schools

Fr. Andrew Greeley has called the achievement of inner city Catholic elementary schools, "one of the most beautiful chapters in the history of American Catholicism." I know that all of us at the conference heartily agreed with that assessment.

To the credit of the Church, and particularly the dedicated priests, sisters and laity who staff them, inner city parishes and schools (with some notable exceptions) have remained steadfast in their commitment to poor inner city minority communities. They have remained open for business while most other "white" institutions, religious, professional and commercial, have sold out and fled. This is true even though the communities which inner city schools serve are usually overwhelmingly non-Catholic.

It must be noted, of course, that for the most part these institutions inherited this challenge. They were not deliberately established to serve the minority poor. Rather, they came to find themselves with this new mission because of the vast expansion of the black population and the black community in heavily Catholic northern urban communities. Parishes which once served middle class white Catholics found themselves with totally new communities as whites fled the city and the black ghetto expanded its boundaries.

Out of a deep Christian commitment, these schools have achieved a remarkable record. Drawing on the strengths of the Catholic educational tradition, inner city Catholic schools have become islands of academic achievement in an ocean of educational failure. They have given the lie to those who blame the failure of inner city public schools on the victims, on "the culture of poverty." They have shown that there are large numbers of poor inner city children who can pass and surpass national academic standards and large numbers of parents ready to make great sacrifices to give their children a good education.

The result has been a tremendous demand for enrollment in these schools. It is ironic that enrollment in Catholic schools is up in the inner city while it is declining in the affluent suburbs. The problem is that the very success of these schools has served to undermine the commitment to Catholic school desegregation in some circles. Some Catholic educators seem to feel that support for inner city schools is a substitute for system-wide integration. They feel such support excuses them from any serious obligation in this direction. They argue, in effect, that successful desegregation programs would "destroy" these excellent inner city schools.

We need to vigorously challenge this theory. Admitting the outstanding achievement of these schools, would their students not benefit even more from

being part of an integrated Catholic school? Must segregated inner city schools be a permanent fact? Are there really "not enough minority students to go around" as opponents of systemwide school desegregation imply? Is it not possible to have both system-wide desegregation and still retain some inner city all-minority schools?

The answer is *we don't know.* We must have more information on the role of these schools relative to system-wide desegregation before we let satisfaction and pride in inner city Catholic schools subtly undermine Catholic commitment to system-wide racial integration.

These are some of the problems before us. There are more, but this is enough to begin our dialogue.

I promise, on behalf of NCCIJ, that we will help you in every way possible. Our goal is to have NCCIJ serve as the clearinghouse for research and planning on this issue. We were pleased that so many people came to our conference. We were especially pleased to welcome the superintendents of Catholic schools from seven major cities. I think we can safely say that at our conference we took a decisive step on that "journey into the future."

Catholic Schools and Racial Integration: A Journey into the Future

by Joseph P. Fitzpatrick, S.J.

Just 44 years ago, almost to the day, on the Feast of Pentecost, the Catholic Interracial Council was founded in New York City by Father John LaFarge and Mr. George Hunton. These men and the cofounders were pressing earnestly for an end to racial discrimination and injustice, and for the acceptance of the blacks as our brothers and sisters in the Lord, long before it became fashionable to do so. In the late 1930's, when I was Director of the then Xavier Labor School in New York City, it was my privilege to meet with the remarkable men and women who were dedicated to the cause of interracial justice. In one of my last conversations with him before he died, Father LaFarge commented that, in 1934, it was thought there was little hope of progress; but, by the late 1950's he was astounded by the progress the blacks had made. He was beginning to have the confidence that the dream was becoming a reality. The existence of this National Conference is one important piece of the dream.

In those early days of the 1930's, our concern was to get black children into Catholic schools, *into* any schools with whites. That is still a major concern; but as the blacks have come in larger numbers into Catholic schools, another more serious issue has emerged: **What happens to them when they get there?** With all the minorities of the nation—Hispanics and Indians as well as blacks—this educational problem is now clearly seen as the critical one. If they do not make it in the schools, they are not going to make it anywhere. How do we enable them to make it? That is what I want to talk about.

I would like to examine their cultures and ours, to talk about strategies of intercultural understanding, communication, and integration in the best sense of the term—how to enable minorities to become part of our society while remaining authentically themselves.

The two large minorities which are our concern are the Hispanics and the blacks. The fact that Hispanics are, for the most part, Catholic adds a special quality to our obligation in their regard. They also represent a special opportunity to the Catholic community since, to a large extent, they are the Catholic community of the future. At the same time, the far greater spiritual and moral

challenge is that of the blacks. It is difficult to discuss both groups at the same time. Since I have had far more experience with Hispanics, my illustrations will come more frequently from that culture. But the basic principles will be applicable to both.

I would like to touch briefly on five aspects of the problem:

1. some basic notions of culture;
2. the fact that our problem is not new; it has been a challenge to the Christian community since the days of the Apostles and has a significant grounding in the experience of the early Church;
3. some comments on the Catholic school as a form of cultural adaptation; it was decidely an alternative educational system linking very distinct Catholic subcultures to the mainstream of American society; and fulfilling an integrating role in a remarkable way (which it must continue to do);
4. some dimensions of the problem; and
5. our response.

1. Culture

Integration is not physical juxtaposition; integration is participation in a common life. Integration in the United States has been marked by one important characteristic: In an amazingly diverse society people participate in a common life yet remain in many ways, themselves. This process has not been without strain. Michael Novak's *Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics* is a moving personal history of the shame for one's cultural identity often engendered by people who think they are helping newcomers become American. Many Hispanic and black children face pain and discouragement in the presence of teachers who think that becoming American means becoming like them. These children are told to divest themselves of the languages, style and customs which are the very source of their sense of dignity and pride.

How can we make schooling a process in which children become part of our common life while remaining authentically themselves? How can we make it a process of communicating our way of life to children in a manner that makes sense to them, in a way that it has some meaning for them within the context of how they see the world? The words are obvious and simple; the practice is not. One of the most difficult things is for a person to perceive the world as another perceives it; to be sensitive to another person's response to a situation which may be very different from his or her own. This is the capacity for intercultural understanding and intercultural communication.

One's culture is, from many important points of view, oneself. It is the total of the meanings things have, the range of ways of thinking, believing, feeling, behaving, reacting which constitutes one's way of life. They are the things that make a person Japanese rather than American; Puerto Rican rather than French; Italian rather than Indian. That whole system of meanings gets built into the deepest levels of personality. The meanings become "*me*."

These meanings become involved in different groups of the human family in very different ways. The Chinese express reverence by making noise. It would be appropriate for them to set off firecrackers at the consecration of the Mass. The Lord is with us: Hooray! The Irish express reverence by keeping silence. A light tinkle of the bell, heads bowed; the Lord is here. If children set off firecrackers at

the consecration in a Dublin Church, they would be considered juvenile delinquents, in China, that would be a suitable way to greet the Lord. Children from rural areas of Puerto Rico, or areas where traditional life still prevails, are taught never to look an adult directly in the face, especially if they are being reprimanded. The first thing American teachers are likely to demand, if they are not sensitive to this, is: "Look at me; don't turn your eyes away. Listen to me; look at me." In trying to make these children respectful by our standards, we force them to do what is disrespectful by their own standards. The consequence is bewilderment, possibly unexpressed resentment or hostility.

Two elements are essential in preparing for intercultural understanding: the phenomenon, i.e. what we see or hear or touch or smell, and the meaning of that phenomenon to us and to others. We cannot convey to others what the phenomenon means to us unless we have some idea what it means to them. Therefore, the main requirement in communicating with others is to be sensitive to the context in which they perceive what is communicated.

These meanings involve values which become intertwined in a set of meanings that gives life the sense it has. Our behavior is not only economic or practical but is intimately related to our values, to our perception of the ultimate meaning and purpose of life, to our perception of the nature of the human person. We identify certain forms of behavior as expressions of our values. For example, the universal value, "Husbands must respect their wives; wives must respect their husbands," is useless until it is known what forms of behavior *mean* respect for a particular group of people. Behavior considered respectful in a devout, middle class North American wife would be considered sinfully disrespectful in a devout middle class wife in Latin America. Let us look at this in a few other examples.

Among the poor of the Caribbean and among the blacks of the South, it is not uncommon for men and women to live together, have children and raise them without ever *formally* marrying. These relationships are called "consensual unions," "free unions," or "keeper unions," they are not promiscuous relationships. Many are stable and life-long, with no shame or guilt associated with their status. Indeed, the morality of the union is judged in terms of the behavior of the man or woman. "He is a good man and a good father; he fulfills his responsibilities to the woman" or "She is a good woman and a good mother; she fulfills her responsibilities toward the man." In Puerto Rico, the consensual union is an officially recorded status in the U.S. Census. Unlike the recent pattern of sophisticated Americans who live together without marrying, consensual union has clear implications of responsibility and commitment, with many of the couples eventually seeking a legal or religious marriage. This cultural practice has a definite meaning pursued within a framework of values which is very difficult for middle class Americans to understand.

Another interesting and rather amusing example: Father Andre Dupeyrat in his wonderful little book, *Savage Papua*, describes the pig as the sacred animal of the Papuans. A woman might nurse a suckling pig at her breast if the sow was not around to keep it alive. In our scriptures, the Lamb is the sacred animal. "Behold the Lamb of God" means absolutely nothing to the Papuans. In order to communicate to the Papuans what "Lamb of God" meant to Hebrews and Christians, Dupeyrat would have to say "Christ is the Pig of God." Jesus a pig! Imagine going into a pulpit in the United States and saying: "Glory to God and praise, and

to Jesus who is the Pig of God!" Yet, to communicate to the Papuans the meaning of "Lamb" in the religious tradition of the West, we must learn what *their* meanings are. We cannot tell others what things mean to us until we have some idea what things mean to them. This is not easy to take, because our deepest values become involved in these meanings. There is no intrinsic relations between the lamb and the Savior, between the lamb and the sacred. Jesus was born among people for whom the lamb was the source of food and clothing, the economic base of their life in society. The pig was a scavenger. In the parable of the Prodigal Son, when Jesus wanted to represent the utter degradation of the son, he described him as feeding pigs. The most wonderful thing a Papuan could do was to feed pigs. Note how these simple, but basic economic realities become the symbols for the expression of our deepest values. Religious meanings become projected in them and they become the context in which our psychological and emotional responses to them as religious symbols get put in place. If the symbol is taken away and replaced with another, the religious experience gets turned upside down.

Black, Hispanic or other minority children come with whole sets of meanings—complex interrelationships of beliefs, knowledge, attitudes, feelings, behavior that constitute their way of life. It is the way they see themselves, the context in which they know where they belong, and who they are. Whatever religious experience they have had will be intertwined profoundly in these sets of meanings. When they come to our schools, they very likely come into a world of learning where the meanings are different, where many features of our life do not make sense to them, where the world is seen in a very different perspective.

They will feel the pressure from us to get ahead, to compete, to "make something of themselves," as we say. Conventional North American values do not permit loyalty to family or friends to block the way to advancement; obligations to the extended family take second place to personal fulfillment. But that is not the way most Latins see the world. While they are concerned about "making something of themselves," about "getting ahead," just as we are, they retain the family as the primary focus. They advance by advancing their families. They make something of themselves as family members, not as isolated individuals. Hispanics will encounter this conflict of values and perspectives, which is not explicit or clearly formulated, but hidden in the subtle tones of voice, the exhortations meant to be sincerely encouraging, which nevertheless caution the child against making choices on the basis of family relationship rather than competence and skill. And all too often we will not even know the conflict is going on. We are subtly asking children to become American by becoming "like us;" the process may easily engender a disrespect for the culture from which they come, possibly a disdain for a way of life which will not enable them to "make it" in our kind of world.

Let me be very clear. I am not saying children will not or should not change. In American society they are going to change in or out of school. The issue is not whether there will be change, but how will the change take place. How should we try to make the change take place? Should the children seek to respond to American values because they are ashamed of their own, because they feel their way of life is second-rate, because they were brought up to be useless? Or will they integrate from a position of strength? They must come into contact with a new world in a way that does not destroy respect for the old world; they must

perceive the values of their way of life, not as something to be ashamed of, or as something second-rate, but as something different. They will come to realize that they must make adjustments in order to participate effectively in our way of life without losing their own historic values.

This process is not easy; it always involves pain, tension, distress and it is a two way street; it means that we must adjust to the newcomers, too. They are bringing something richly human and beautiful in their way of life; some of the surrender should be on our part, not theirs. The achievement of unity out of culturally diverse peoples is a difficult process of human adjustment.

2. The Experience of the Early Church

This kind of cultural adaptation is not new in the life of the Church. It is a challenge that has faced the Church since its very beginnings. The first Christians were all Jews who came out of the traditions of the Hebrew religion and the Mosaic Law. That was the divinely ordained way God had given them to show their religious fidelity, and the early Christians took it for granted that this would continue. Fidelity to the Hebrew way of life was identical with fidelity to God. But what were they going to do when the Gentiles asked to become members of the Christian community? What were they going to do with Romans and Greeks and Syrians and Egyptians, all of whom spoke different languages, lived according to different ways of life, and were often disdained by the Hebrews and considered inferior?

Note that this cultural challenge is not unlike the challenge that faces us in the cultural adaptations necessary today. Among the early Christians it was much more serious. It was God who settled the issue. In the clearest revelation given since the Ascension of Our Lord, God instructed Peter that the Gentiles were not to be required to become Hebrews in order to be baptized and to live in the Christian community. They were to remain Romans and Greeks and Egyptians. "*God has been showing me,*" said Peter, "*that he is no respecter of particular races or peoples; He accepts any person who seeks to do His will and does what piety demands.*" (Acts: 10.) When Peter weakened on this point at the first great Gentile Church in Antioch, Paul confronted him sharply in the presence of the entire assembly "*Who are you, being a Hebrew, to be trying to impose on the Gentiles Hebrew ways?*" (Gal. 2) The first council of the Church, the Council at Jerusalem (Acts. 15) was convened to settle this issue. The Gentiles were to remain free to express the life of Jesus in the context of their own culture. They were not to be burdened by being required to adopt the Hebrew way of life in order to be Christians. The Church was to be *Katolikos*, a unity manifesting itself in broad diversity of people. That indeed is what Pentecost celebrates.

Therefore, in our need to face the problems in intercultural adjustment and collaboration, we are solidly in the tradition of the Church. To be a Catholic is to strive for unity in diversity—the manifestation of the life of Jesus in a mosaic of human styles and ways of life. The thing that makes the beauty of the Queen, says the Psalm, is that she is surrounded by variety.

3. The Catholic Schools as an Integrating Force

What the history of Catholic education represents is the creation of an alternative educational system related to distinct cultural needs, the religious needs of the Catholic Community. When the decision was made early in the last century to

make education available to the citizens of our new Nation, the public school systems that began to develop were not acceptable to Catholic minorities. The school was seen as the great instrument through which the youth of the Nation were to be taught to become intelligent and participating Americans. But it was dominated by the Protestant majority, many of whom saw Catholicism (particularly as practiced by the Irish) as a threat to the American way of life, a danger to its institutions. To become American, the Protestant majority were convinced, meant to become *like them*.

The Catholics refused to accept this position. They had come to this country to share its religious and political freedoms. It was not some modification of themselves that was to become American; it was themselves, with their own cultural background, their own religious beliefs and their own interest in American political life. It was to be a religiously and culturally pluralistic nation. They would make it so.

One of the institutions they created was the Catholic school. It would meet every required objective of the public school; it would satisfy the demands of the State and Nation; but it would do it in a Catholic way, more specifically, a German Catholic or Italian Catholic or Polish Catholic or Irish Catholic way. The parochial school, emerging out of the heart of the immigrant communities, was permeated by the spirit of the people who brought it into being and was supported, at great sacrifice, by the immigrant poor whose children were to be educated in it. The parochial school communicated the cultural background of the immigrant children in a remarkable, creative way, while preparing them for participation in the mainstream of American life. It fulfilled the task of integration in a very effective way, while enabling the newcomers to retain a deep sense of themselves, their identity, their way of life.

Indeed, the Catholic school may have done its job too well. It has been the major instrument in bringing most of the children of immigrant Catholics into the middle class, or even upper middle class, of the United States. As middle class citizens, they have lost contact with the poor; in many ways they have lost the perspective of newcomers struggling against many odds to break into the mainstream of American life. The middle class now faces a massive population of new and strange people, with new and strange ways. And the question has to be asked again: How does the school, in this new situation, continue its integrating task? How does it enable the newcomers to become part of the mainstream of American life while remaining, in significant ways, themselves?

It cannot be done in quite the same way. The contemporary economic and religious situations make it practically impossible for the newcomers to create schools for themselves which do what the Catholic schools did for the earlier immigrants. We, and they, have to take the system as it actually exists and make the realistic adjustments and innovations which are necessary to enable the newcomers to achieve in a new and contemporary way what the poor Catholics were able to achieve in previous generations. This will not be easy, either for the newcomers or for us. It will not be possible at all without a profound sensitivity to their culture and way of life, and a creative capacity in ourselves to enable them to be themselves while preparing to participate in our common life as Americans.

4. The Dimensions of the Challenge

The task would be easier if the dimensions were more limited—but the task is

enormous. From the viewpoint of the changing populations, in the public school system of New York City, at the present time the largest school system in the world, 71 percent of the school population are black and Hispanic. At the present rate of change, in ten years it will be 86 percent black and Hispanic. The parochial schools of the New York Archdiocese are about 33 percent black and Hispanic; the undergraduate colleges of Fordham University are 25 percent black and Hispanic. Furthermore, the Hispanic population is the most rapidly increasing population of the United States. Between 1970 and 1976 the Hispanic population increased by 22 percent (from 9 to 11 million) while the total population increased by only 3.7 percent. The Hispanic population is a very young population. The median age for Hispanics in 1976 was 20 years; the median age for the U.S. population was 28 years; the median age for second generation Puerto Ricans in 1976 was 9.7 years.

One half of second generation Puerto Ricans are children under 9.7 years of age. This means a rapidly growing teenage population for many years to come, while the teenage proportion of the total population will be diminishing. Hispanics are an extremely poor population. In 1975 one third of all Puerto Rican families, 26.5 percent of all Mexican-American families, and 17 percent of all Cuban families were below the poverty level, contrasted with 9.7 percent of all families in the United States below the poverty level. Hispanic drop out rates, especially at high school level, are very high. Consequently, they cannot qualify for white collar jobs and, in cities like New York, their rate of unemployment is very high. In the U.S. as a whole, 14 percent of Puerto Ricans are unemployed in contrast to 8.1 percent unemployment for the total labor force. In New York City the unemployment rate of black and Puerto Rican youths is about 40 percent. Second generation Puerto Rican youth do much better than the first, but they are such a youthful population that they are not yet appearing in education and employment statistics.

Unless these minority groups can be kept in school it is unlikely that they will ever qualify for available jobs as employment, occupational level, and income all depend on educational success. The drop out phenomenon is related not so much to children's presence in school, as to what happens to them after they get there. This is the population to which we must respond, the population that must be integrated into our society through the efforts in many cases of the Catholic school.

The significant message in these and other figures is: **unless the minorities stay in school, there is little chance of their making it.** Staying in school is directly related to our ability to provide a learning experience that is meaningful to them, our ability to meet them, culturally, where they are.

5. The Response

There are many aspects to the question of our response. I am aware of the sociological issue that is raised in relation to poverty: whether integration of minorities into the mainstream of American life is a myth. Some people argue that radical social and institutional change is the only solution. In a long range evaluation of our capitalist society, that may be true but it is not very helpful in terms of immediate improvement. Our immediate task, it seems to me, is to do the best we possibly can within the broad institutional structure that is going to be with us for a considerable length of time. I am aware of the economic issue, the

problem of enabling Catholic schools to survive, and enabling us to find the resources which will make it possible to make the necessary adjustments for the minority populations. I am aware of the debate that continues about the whole idea of Catholic schools. Most of the blacks and Puerto Ricans in New York City, for example, are in public schools. Isn't it more important to use our energy and resources by serving as their advocates in the public school situation rather than trying to provide Catholic schools for them? I am aware of the mixed motivations which bring many children into the parochial schools—escape from the blacks, fear of danger in the public schools, concern for social status rather than for religious values.

This paper addresses itself to one social situation and to one issue. The social situation is the fact that we have an enormous education resource of which large numbers of our minorities have already availed themselves, as will hundreds of thousands more. The issue is: what do we do with this enormous educational resource when the minorities enter it? Ideally, it should be a very flexible system. We have much more control over it than we have over the public system. Ideally, we should be able to respond creatively to the new minorities much more easily than the complicated bureaucracies of the public system can. It is disappointing that in so many situations we have not done this. I don't want to minimize the serious efforts in many places and some remarkably creative efforts in some. But, by and large, the record of cultural adjustment is not impressive.

The response requires money. We all know that. But what is the best we can do with the economic resources we do have? The response requires method and technique. We all know that, too. Here we must rely on our experienced educational personnel; we have many of them. But there will be no response, if the spirit and determination are not there. The response requires the awareness of the meaning of intercultural understanding and communication, the sensitivity to the experience of children who face in our schools the adjustment to a new and strange way of life, the alertness to the importance of enabling them to develop a pride and respect for who and what they are, of the preparation of them to integrate from a position of strength, not from a position of weakness. We can get very far along that route even with limited financial resources; the vision of the task will enable us to find the methods and techniques. Like the early Hebrew Christians, we have to realize that God not only wants us to communicate to "them" the richness of our lives, but He is also telling us that we need the richness of their lives if we are going to grow.

That is where the response is needed. To sum it up with a little story: A traveler, walking through Chartres when the Cathedral was being built, came upon a group of workers who were mixing cement. He asked the first worker, "Sir, what are you doing?" The worker replied with some indignation, "Can't you see, I'm mixing cement." He asked the second worker, "Sir, what are you doing?" And the second worker replied rather sharply, "What do you think I am doing, I'm working to support my family." And he asked the third worker, "Sir, what are you doing?" And the third worker replied, "Look at it, sir. I am building a Cathedral." As we go about our task, I hope we will not be preoccupied only with day-to-day classroom routines—mixing cement. I hope we will not be preoccupied with sheer economic survival—working to support a family. I hope we will see that out of the new and strange human stones that the Lord has sent us, we are building the living Cathedral of the Church and the Nation of tomorrow.

Integration of Catholic Schools: What is Possible? What is Working?

by Frances Flanigan, H. M.

The Ninth Annual Gallup Poll of the public's attitude toward the public schools revealed that the issue of integration/segregation/busing was singled out as the second most serious problem facing the public schools.[1] (The area of first concern was discipline.) The integration problem was rated second not only by public school parents (11 percent), but, surprisingly enough, by an even larger percentage of parents whose children attended parochial school (18 percent). Even adults who had no children in school perceived the issue in the same manner as adults with children (13 percent).

Although the Gallup poll specifically concerned integration of the public schools, many Catholics have been increasingly troubled by the racial isolation within the Catholic schools. This question is usually raised in connection with court-ordered desegregation of the public schools. As the local church becomes involved in attempts to assist in the peaceful implementation of the court order, more and more discussion centers around the faculty and student composition in Catholic schools.

The Statement of the Catholic Church

The whole racial problem is one which the bishops and recent popes have addressed in forceful and direct language. The problem of racial isolation is not one which concerns only the schools; but rather, it is a problem that confronts all of society, including the church. Within the church the racial problem must be dealt with on all levels and in all institutions. It cannot be identified as solely a school problem.

In 1963, the beloved John XXIII issued *Pacem In Terris*, a papal declaration on human dignity and human rights. Pope John saw three distinctive characteristics of the modern world. The working classes had gained ground in economic and public affairs, women were more conscious of their dignity and demanding all the rights and privileges of human persons . . . (and this in 1963), and races

which had been discriminated against were claiming their rights. He wrote:

> Thus, in our day, in very many human beings the inferiority complex which endured for hundreds and thousands of years is disappearing, while in others there is an attentuation and gradual fading of the corresponding superiority complex which had its roots in socio-economic privileges, sex, or political standing.
>
> On the contrary, the conviction that all men are equal by reason of their natural dignity has been generally accepted. Hence, racial discrimination can in no way be justified, at least doctrinally or in theory.[2]

The American bishops, in the same year, reaffirmed their previous position in the joint pastoral letter *On Racial Harmony.* The bishops quoted the encyclical by Pope John and invited all Catholics to accept personal responsibility to work for racial justice.

> We can show our Christian charity by a quiet and courageous determination to make the quest for racial harmony a matter of personal involvement. We must go beyond slogans and generalizations about color, and realize that all of us are human beings, men, women, and children, all sharing the same human nature and feelings. We should try to know and understand one another.[3]

The bishops then went on to suggest discussions among people of the same work or professions and the use of parish and diocesan societies as common meeting groups. Mention was made of working to see that voting, jobs, housing, education and public facilities were made available to every American.

Pope Paul VI in his declaration on the relationship of the Church to non-Christian religions, *Nostra Aetate*, reaffirmed the teaching of Pope John.

> The ground is therefore removed from every theory or practice which leads to a discrimination between men or peoples in the matter of human dignity and the rights which flow from it.
>
> As a consequence, the church rejects, as foreign to the mind of Christ, any discrimination against men or harrassment of them because of their race, color, condition of life, or religion.[4]

On the eightieth anniversary of *Rerum Novarum*, Pope Paul again addressed the matter of racial discrimination. He referred to tension that racial discrimination was causing throughout the world and called again for an end to all practices of discrimination.[5]

In 1972, the American bishops published their pastoral on Catholic Education, *To Teach As Jesus Did.* They called upon the Catholic school to respond to the challenges created by racial and ethnic tensions.

> Since the Gospel spirit is one of peace, brotherhood, love, patience, and respect for others, a school rooted in these principles ought to explore ways to deepen its students' concern for and skill in peacemaking and the achievement of justice.[6]

The bishops went on to refer to what they called the unfinished business on the agenda of Catholic schools, namely, the "task of providing quality education for the poor and disadvantaged of our nation."[7] They recognized that in order for the Church to be able to continue to offer to the poor a quality education, sacrifice would be required from all Church members.

In 1975, as the American Nation prepared to celebrate its Bicentennial, the United States Catholic Conference and the National Catholic Conference of Bishops called upon all Catholics to take part in discussions on the meaning of the Nation's two hundredth birthday. In preparation for discussions across the country, a booklet was prepared entitled *Liberty and Justice for All*. This booklet designated eight basic topics for discussion: The Church, Humankind, Ethnicity and Race, the Neighborhood, Work, Family, Personhood and the Church in the United States. The issues of social justice, especially with regard to race, appeared at various times in the booklet, but the topic of school integration was not mentioned.

A pastoral of Archbishop Gerety of Newark is quoted in which he wrote, "We must admit that we have not listened very carefully to Pope John's teaching or to the teaching after him of the Second Vatican Council, of Pope Paul VI and of the Synod of Bishops, on matters of Justice . . . Their teaching has been a call for our conversion."[8] Several authors within the book called for a re-commitment of the Church to issues of social justice and a re-examination of what it means to be an American Catholic. Father David Tracy wrote in his chapter on the Church,

> As a community we must find words and actions which will allow the Church's liberating tradition of social justice to reach and assist all who need that hope and aid. As institution, as the pilgrim people of God, as the servant of all true causes of justice and Christ in love.[9]

Father Emerson Moore, a black priest from New York City, discussed the issue of black pride and nationalism and called upon the Church to address the special needs of black Catholics. He wrote, "To a great extent, the Church today has remained a silent spectator in the cause of social change for black America. It can and must do more. As a first step, it must look to the needs and abilities of its own black members."

Call to Action

The booklet *Liberty and Justice for All* was the basis of a nationwide consultation in which all replies were eventually fed into a computer and a huge print-out was obtained. This print-out was then made available to the 1350 delegates and participants and 1000 observers in the National Call to Action Conference held in Detroit, in October 1976.

In only one of the 180 resolutions that came from that Call to Action Conference is there mention of the integration of Catholic schools.

> The local church acting through pastoral councils (diocesan and parish), and boards of education should determine the priorities of schools in their areas and exercise responsibility for their continuation and management. This responsibility should include an active program of desegregation, racial, economic and social, in Catholic schools.[10]

At the annual meeting of the United States bishops the following May (1977), a statement was adopted in response to the recommendations of the Call to Action Conference. In this response the bishops stated that "We support the thrust of recommendations for continued efforts to eradicate racial and ethnic discrimination, even when unconscious and unintended, in both church and society."[11] Their statement on racism would be forthcoming.

> Since racism is among the most persistent and destructive evils in our nation, we shall continue to address this abuse in words and actions. In view of the recommendations for a collective pastorial "on the sin of racism in both its personal and social dimensions" we shall seek to develop such a document.[12]

It is evident that the popes and bishops have spoken out forcefully against racism and its attendant evils. However, the topic of racial isolation within the Catholic schools has not been specifically mentioned.

The Statistics

Any consideration of racial isolation within the Catholic schools must take into account the fact that over 90 percent of all "churched" black Americans belong to a Protestant denomination. Only six percent of the nation's blacks are Roman Catholic, and this figure includes both adults and children.[13]

In 1971 the National Catholic Education Association (NCEA) published a report entitled *Integration in Catholic Schools*. The following statistics from that report give a clear picture of the racial isolation that existed.

There were 2,950,186 students in Catholic elementary schools: 88.6 percent were white, 5.2 percent were Spanish surnamed, .5 percent were American Negro and .5 percent were American Indian. 85.5 percent of all elementary students were in all white or mostly white schools. In 1970 there were 3,953 minority teachers at the elementary level and none of these was in the all-white schools.[14]

The 1978 NCEA report reveals that over the past six years the percentage of black students has increased in elementary schools from 5.1 percent to 7.6 percent and in secondary schools from 3.7 percent to 5.8 percent. The number of Spanish surnamed pupils has increased from 5 percent to 7.5 percent. Overall, the percentage of ethnic minority students has increased from 10.8 percent to 16 percent. Despite the loss of a million students since 1971, the number of ethnic students enrolled has increased by 67,000.[15]

Although no comparable figures are available for public schools, the Bureau of Census gives combined percentages of pupils, both public and private. Their figures break down this total enrollment as: 14.4 percent black, 6.2 percent Spanish Origin, 1.8 percent Oriental, and 77.6 percent white. On this basis Catholic schools would seem to serve a lesser percentage of black and Oriental students and a great percentage of Spanish surnamed. The 1978 report did not identify schools by racial enrollment.

If there are many problems surrounding the desegregation of the public school system, the nature and number of problems which are involved in desegragating Catholic schools are even greater. To identify the problems and the questions which must be addressed is not to say that these problems can never be solved, but rather to place the problem in the proper context.

The Problem in Context

Attendance at Catholic schools is purely voluntary and carries with it the obligation to pay a certain sum of tuition. Experience has shown that when parents are dissatisfied with the program or the teacher, when the tuition goes up, or when the school does not meet the parents' expectations, the student is simply withdrawn and enrolled in another school. While the court may order the

public schools to assign their students to attend a certain school, there is no similar vehicle, either within or without the church, to order Catholic school students to attend a specific school. The pastor cannot force students to attend the parochial school; he obviously cannot compel attendance at another school. In the case of the local parish school, attendance is ordinarily limited to those who are parish members because the local parish contributes heavily to the support and maintenance of the school. Where children attend from a parish which has no school, special arrangements are made with the pastor of the parish with the school. Most parishes are willing to enroll non-parishioners and non-Catholics, if space is available.

In the urban areas of the country, Catholic schools have performed a tremendous service in educating black and minority students. Black parents are choosing the Catholic school because of their desire to give their children a good education. They believe that the Catholic school provides better discipline, instills good study habits, and requires students to meet certain standards of performance. Although the black parents are predominantly of the Protestant faith, they appreciate the opportunity their children have to learn moral values, even though the dogma may be opposed to their own fundamentalist beliefs. These schools are often attended by an all-black population, and their teaching staffs are often predominantly, if not totally, black. Jesse Jackson has recently called upon public schools to go to the local Catholic school to see what the school expects of the child and of the parents.

It must be remembered that many black parents and teachers believe that a black school is the best way to instill pride in black culture and black achievements. A recent statement by the National Office of Black Catholics which addressed the crisis of Catholic education in the black community spoke to this issue.

> The Catholic school can also serve the invaluable function of being a vehicle for the maintenance of Black culture and heritage. This is particularly important since many of the Black public schools which have traditionally fulfilled this purpose are being dismantled in the name of integration. Black culture, as experience shows, is too frequently swallowed up by the dominant white society.[16]

Thus, there may be many black students who prefer to stay within a black Catholic school which has done such a fine job of educating these youngsters. In many cases, urban Catholic schools have experienced a declining enrollment of parishioners and are therefore able to accept non-Catholic black students. In suburban areas, however, many schools are crowded and cannot accept non-Catholic students.

Financing presents another problem. Today most Catholic schools are struggling for their very existence. Tuitions are rising rapidly, utility costs are soaring, and more and more time, effort and work are required to support fund raising programs. Should efforts to integrate Catholic schools be tied in with a busing plan, these costs would hasten and exacerbate the financial crisis.

Do all these negative factors mean that we should not strive for true integration of our schools? No indeed. But the effort must be more inclusive and should focus not on the schools alone, but on all institutions within the Church and within society. The challenge of integration on all levels is not primarily or solely

a school problem. It is a Church problem.

As Archbishop Thomas McDonough wrote in his statement regarding the court ordered desegregation of schools in Louisville and Jefferson County, Kentucky:

> The first thing that must be said in reply is that the issue which confronts us is not simply a "school problem." It is a community problem. It is a problem for whose creation and solution everyone in the community must accept a share of responsibility.[17]

The United States Conference of Bishops in their pastoral on education pointed out what they considered to be "The unfinished business on the agenda of the Catholic schools—that of providing quality education for the poor and disadvantaged of our nation."[18] It is interesting to note that in none of the recent statements by the bishops has the question of integrating Catholic schools been directly addressed. Rather, in each of them, there has been a condemnation of racism and a call to continue efforts to address the needs of the poor.

Agenda for Integration

What can be on the agenda for achieving true integration in our schools? "Integration" is the word rather than "desegregation" because the latter term is concerned only with mixing numbers of bodies while integration calls for meaningful cooperation where the rights of all are respected and their cultural values and contributions are acknowledged. The goal of integrated education requires much more than racial balancing.

It is possible for every Catholic school, whether rich or poor, whether urban or rural or suburban, to have a curriculum which is integrated and which teaches that we are living in a multi-cultural, multi-racial society. Such a curriculum is not dependent upon funding or parental approval or new programming.

There is a wealth of material available for use by school administrators and teachers in helping children to learn about the various races and ethnic groups. The amount and quality of materials makes it much easier to implement such a goal. We are fortunate that in recent years textbooks and materials have been examined to make sure that old stereotypes are not passed along and that minorities are portrayed in a variety of roles.

Religious communities who staff schools in various sections of the city have an advantage in sponsoring exchange programs between children of the suburbs and children of the city. They can work around the parish problem and have arrangements made for visiting days, athletic events and cooperative ventures. Where these programs are more than one-shot, children can really get to know one another and can make friends of different racial or ethnic backgrounds. Children's attitudes do change when they have the opportunity for contact with youngsters of another race. Outdoor education programs or camping experiences, where both teachers and students spend several days working and learning with their counterparts of another race, have also proved helpful.

The Chicago Archdiocese operated a program entitled Operation Hospitality for six years. Approximately 300 elementary school students, grades four through eight, from 20 inner city parishes, were bused to outer-city and suburban schools. The program was designed to help black and white youngsters learn

more about each other and to defuse prejudices. The parents were also involved in the project. The program was very successful but unfortunately it had to be stopped because of lack of money.[19]

Programs to make children aware of persons of other races and backgrounds include, but are not limited to, exchange programs between schools; attendance at cultural events sponsored by different ethnic or racial groups, and use of media in explaining different cultures and customs. Social justice and the call of the Church to promote equality among all peoples should be a definite part of the religious education program.

One program in peace and justice was drawn up in the Louisville Archdiocese, by the Peace and Justice Center. Project Insight consisted of a five day workshop in black awareness for junior and senior high school students.[20] By holding the sessions at St. Benedict Parish in the West End, students were able to see the neighborhood and people they were studying. The content included an overview of the history of American blacks and of the black church, and an account of the blacks' experience in Kentucky.

Affirmative Action programs which encourage minority students to consider enrolling in the Catholic schools should be launched. Many black students may not want to attend an all-white school, but the opportunity ought to be there. The enrollment of black students should be encouraged, especially in the high schools. Here, there is no problem with parish membership. At least in our diocese, there are no parish high schools, only diocesan community schools. Efforts to help minority students with the payment of tuition through grant programs or work-study programs must also be promoted. A recent article suggests that high school students often can take advantage of existing means of transportation and that fleets of buses need not be considered.[21]

Affirmative action programs aimed at encouraging minority teachers, paraprofessionals, and volunteers must be promoted. Unfortunately, the public sector is also involved in affirmative action and we sometimes find ourselves in competition for the same qualified people. Here, we are at a disadvantage with the salaries we can offer. Nevertheless, efforts must be made to recruit people of different backgrounds to work in our schools, so that all children, black and white, will see people of various races working in all positions. Retired persons who might serve as paraprofessionals or volunteers ought especially to be invited.

The recent publication by the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice, *Doors*, is an excellent aid to persons trying to work for affirmative action.[22] The booklet is quite clear on how to open doors to others.

When Catholic schools are merging or consolidating, consideration must be given to achieving an integrated student body. In the southern dioceses where there had been a dual system of church schools by state law, integration was accomplished relatively easily through pairing of nearby schools or by merging the enrollments of both schools in one building. Busing was not always required.[23] Currently, in many of the large dioceses, inner-city, urban populations are declining and suburban populations are growing. Urban schools are losing students while suburban Catholic schools are so crowded they are turning them away. Perhaps, there are courageous pastors somewhere who would con-

sider renting a bus and driving the surplus suburban white children into the city where there is a building with available classroom space. This lend-lease arrangement, where the parish with no school uses the facilities which are underutilized by the parish with the school, would certainly be much less expensive than a building program. It could also lead to some real integration within our schools.

Efforts at integrating Catholic schools by encouraging public school children and black children to attend are best done before the local public school district has been ordered to desegregate. Usually, when the public school is ordered to formulate a plan for desegregation, the local bishop announces restrictions on the admission of public school children. Once the court has found liability and ordered a remedy, the Catholic schools are unable to recruit without violating their own guidelines. Perhaps in some city or town the opportunity will be presented for the local Catholic school superintendent and the local public school superintendent to confer about voluntary and concurrent ways of integrating schools without the involvement of the court. Cleveland was able to inaugurate an exchange program between a public high school and a Catholic high school, with financial help of a foundation, before the court had found liability.

In May 1978, the National Conference of Bishops voted for a five year plan to implement the Call to Action Conference. This plan includes programs for the education of the people to the ministry of peace and justice and a program of affirmative action for the dioceses. The bishops wrote, "Racism remains a major concern. This blight on American society is of special concern because of its deep moral implications."[24] A pastoral letter on the subject is to be written in 1979 and a set of guidelines for affirmative action will be published by mid-1979 for diocesan evaluation and implementation. No specific mention was made of integration or of desegregation.

The Process

How then will the integration of Catholic schools occur? Probably from local initiative, at the rate of one school at a time. Maybe it will be inaugurated by a pastor who really cares about the issues and who can lead his people with him. Perhaps some community of sisters which staffs schools in various parts of the city can get a program together.

Perhaps the reason the whole question of racial isolation is so complicated and so difficult is that we have not done our homework in instructing our own people about justice and the demands of justice. We cannot wait for any day in the dim future—we must start now, by integrated education, to prepare our students to take their place in a multi-cultural, multi-ethnic, multi-racial world. It's the only world that they will know—and it's the world the way the Lord made it.

Footnotes

[1]George M. Gallup, "Ninth Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes toward the Public School." *Phi Delta Kappan*, XLIX (September, 1977), p. 46.

[2]Pope John XXIII, *Pacem in Terris*, quoted in *The Gospel of Peace and Justice*, presented by Joseph Gremillion (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1975), pp. 209-210.

[3]*On Racial Harmony*, Joint Pastoral Letter of the Bishops of the United States (Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1963).

[4]Pope Paul VI, *Nostra Aetate*, quoted in *The Gospel of Peace and Justice*, presented by Joseph Gremillion (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1975), pp. 376-377.

[5]Pope Paul VI, *Octogesima Adveniens*, quoted in *The Gospel of Peace and Justice*, presented by Joseph Gremillion (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1975) p. 493.

[6]National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *To Teach As Jesus Did* (Washington, D.C: Publications Office, U.S. Catholic Conference, 1972), pp. 30-31.

[7]*Ibid.*, p. 34.

[8]National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Liberty and Justice for All* (Washington, D.C: Committee for the Bicentennial, 1974), p.24

[9]*Ibid.*, p.24.

[10]*Ibid.*, p. 37.

[11]"A Response to the Call to Action," *Origins* (May 19, 1977), p. 760.

[12]*Ibid.*

[13]Thomas F. Pettigrew, *Racially Separate or Together?* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1971), p. 57

[14]*Integration in the Catholic Schools*, National Catholic Education Association (Washington, D.C., 1971), p. 39.

[15]Mary Mahar, ed., *Catholic Schools in America* (Denver: Curriculum Information Center, 1978), pp. xii-xvi.

[16]National Office of Black Catholics, *The Crisis of Catholic Education in the Black Community*, (January 15, 1976), p. 3.

[17]Archbishop Thomas McDonough, Statement on School Integration, included in information received from Project Insight, Louisville, Kentucky.

[18]National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *To Teach As Jesus Did* (Washington, D.C: Publications Office, U.S. Catholic Conference, 1972), p. 34.

[19]Burleigh B. Gardner, *et al. The Effect of Busing Black Ghetto Children Into White Suburban Schools* (Chicago: Social Research, Inc., 1970).

[20]*Project Insight*, materials sent from Peace and Justice Center, Louisville, Kentucky, 1976.

[21]John A. McDermott, "Let's Desegregate Catholic Schools," *National Catholic Reporter* (March 31, 1978), p. 13.

[22]*Doors, A Guide to Equal Opportunity in Employment and Promotion* (Washington, D.C: National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice, 1977).

[23]William Peters, *The Southern Temper* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1959), p. 106.

[24]*NCCB/USCC Documentation*, Item #4, Call to Action Plan.

References

Crain, Robert L. *The Politics of School Desegregation*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1968.

The Crisis of Catholic Education in the Black Community. National Office of Black Catholics. January 15, 1976.

Gallup, George H. "Ninth Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools." *Phi Delta Kappan*. XLIX (September, 1977), pp. 33-48.

Gremillion, Joseph, presenter, *The Gospel of Peace and Justice*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1976.

"Justice in the Church." *Origins*, November 4, 1976, pp. 311-313.

Mahar, Mary, ed., *Catholic Schools in America*. Denver: Curriculum Information Center, Inc., 1978.

McDermott, John A. "Let's Desegregate Catholic Schools." *National Catholic Reporter*, March 31, 1978, p. 13.

National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice. *Catholic Schools and Racial Integration: Perspectives, Directions, Models*. Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice, 1977.

National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice, *Doors, A Guide to Equal Opportunity in Employment and Promotion*. Washington, D. C.: National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice, 1978.

National Conference of Catholic Bishops. *Liberty and Justice for All*. Washington, D.C.: Committee for Bicentennial, 1975.

National Conference of Catholic Bishops. *To Live In Christ Jesus*. Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1976.

National Conference of Catholic Bishops. *To Teach As Jesus Did*. Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1973.

On Racial Harmony. Joint Pastoral Letter of the Bishops of the United States, Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1963.

Pettigrew, Thomas F. *Racially Separate or Together*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

United States Commission on Civil Rights, *Fulfilling the Letter and Spirit of the Law: Desegregation of the Nation's Public Schools*. Washington, D.C.: 1976.

"A Response to the Call to Action." *Origins*, May 19, 1977, pp. 757-764.

Smith, Kathleen, ed., *Desegregation/Integration, Planning for School Change*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1974.

Integration of Catholic Schools: What is Possible? What is Working?

by Rev. David Sorohan

In early March 1977, the Federal District Court of the Southern District of Ohio rendered its findings after nearly three months of testimony and research, and announced its decision that the public schools of Columbus, Ohio, were racially segregated, and that this segregation had been intentional. Almost simultaneously, six major cities and public school districts in Ohio, located within four of the six Catholic dioceses in Ohio, found themselves involved in legal suits on identical charges of segregation, *de facto* and *de jure*. It appeared to many involved in education that the State of Ohio had been targeted as one of the northern states where public school integration was to be tested in a second effort by those pursuing equal educational opportunity for all races. Having heard of and watched other nothern cities and their efforts in desegregation of public schools, the Superintendents of Catholic Schools in the six dioceses of Ohio began intensive consultations on the haunting question of the integration of Catholic schools being raised more and more in every quarter.

Through many hours of discussion, and after consultation with other dioceses, such as Louisville, Kentucky and Boston, Massachusetts, the Ohio Catholic superintendents took several steps as a group in response to concerns about Catholic school integration. First, a position paper, rejecting the idea of the Catholic school as a haven for those escaping an integrated education, was drafted and adopted by the Ohio Conference of Catholic Bishops. The same statement endorsed the concept of integrated schools, and, depending on the status of court proceedings in each diocese, spoke to the issue of peaceful implementation of any court order for public school desegregation. The statement was widely disseminated in the Catholic and secular press and media.

Second, the Catholic superintendents urged their respective Boards of Education to review and to adopt new regulations, if necessary, for the admittance and

transfer of students into Catholic schools. Based on the experience of other Catholic dioceses and archdioceses, priorities on admission and transfer of students were adopted and promulgated. Parishes were encouraged to establish a screening committee at each school to interview prospective students and their families prior to acceptance in school. While there was no magic set of questions provided to detect racists and segregationists, this approach was successful in preserving the integrity of the local parish school.

Third, programs were inaugurated within schools for principals, teachers and students directed at two major areas of concern regarding integration: a) Curriculum materials were reviewed and previewed with an eye toward equality of the races, how presentations were made in textbooks on ethnic backgrounds and total ethnic coverage. Workshops were conducted by the Central Office Staff to train principals, teachers and students in determining textbook fairness. b) A speaker corps was established and trained in the precepts of the 14th amendment to the U. S. Constitution, the history of public school desegregation, the remedial plan for desegregation of the Columbus public schools, and in conflict resolution techniques. Speakers were made available to parishes, and emphasis was placed on using this as the Advent topic for adult education programs in the diocese.

Fourth, a series of single-day workshops and seminars was sponsored for pastors or parishes on topics similar to those presented for educators. Clergy days were devoted in their entirety to this topic in order to educate and sensitize the clergy on potential conflicts within their parishes and methods of relating to and dealing with the problems. Churches were involved with prayer services, evening vigils of prayers, weekly petitions for weekend liturgies, and pastoral letters were written and read at liturgical celebrations from the bishop of the diocese.

These and similar activities were carried out in an attempt to educate Catholic people about integration of Catholic schools, although no specific steps had yet been taken. The first attempt at integration was a two step process which was not very successful. A policy was announced that amounted to open transfer for any black student into a school to enhance the racial balance of the school. While some students did in fact transfer, there were too few to make the impact significant. The second step requested that the pastors, on two of the clergy education days, discuss the voluntary integration of neighboring schools and parishes on a pairing model. In 34 parishes, one pastor volunteered and two other pastors launched an attack on the plan.

At the beginning of the diocesan effort, the Bishop of Columbus established an Ad Hoc Committee on School Integration with fairly wide representation of diocesan departments and agencies. Many of the plans and programs thus far described were the work of this committee. The decision was made toward the end of the 1976 school term to focus greater attention on the Catholic school integration issue during the following year. Although little concrete has been accomplished during the present school term, plans have become more formal, and the hope is that more significant progress can be made in the months ahead. Some of the plans are as follows:

Overview of the Diocese of Columbus, Ohio

In December 1976, a case study on the Diocese of Columbus, Ohio, was presented at a workshop on the integration of Catholic schools. The case study outlined four possible models of system-wide voluntary integration of the schools in Columbus: *

I. **Transformation of several buildings that house grades 1 to 8 into schools for grades 1 to 5, together with the establishment of racially balanced regional middle or junior high schools.**

II. **Reorganization of all schools, gerrymandering the boundaries, to achieve a 15 to 45 percent racial mixture in each school.**

III. **Pairing of several schools to achieve greater racial balance.**

IV. **Leaving all schools with the current racial composition while concentrating on the quality of education offered in those schools that are predominantly black.**

In an attempt to move forward with the integration of Catholic schools in the diocese, it was agreed that the approach should be on a voluntary basis. Each parish school would decide on its own, with encouragement and assistance from the Diocesan School Office. Because of the small numbers of black students in the Catholic schools, city or county-wide integration of schools would appear to be tokenism. Therefore, a second decision was made to attempt the voluntary integration of schools on model "III", that is by "pairing." If one were to apply the percentages in the court's public school remedial plan (32 to 68 percent), the Columbus Catholic schools would be adjudged to have four racially identifiable schools. One of those schools will close at the end of the current year for financial reasons.

If the diocese moves in this direction of "pairing" of elementary schools toward achieving integration, there are many concerns at this point in the planning process. These concerns, these tentative next steps are: planning, selling the idea, and preparing for integration in the particular school involved.

A. Planning

1. The academic program must be worked out in sufficient detail so that the new integrated school would offer a program as good or better than that in either school before integration. Obviously, the details would have to await a decision, but we could project whatever unique ideas we have for remedial, enrichment and extracurricular programs.
2. A school philosophy should be sketched out assuring the continued Catholic character of the school. It should also address the critical issue of school discipline, and probably also some ideas on teaching-learning style. A joint committee could be charged with this (with membership from both faculties and parish staffs—and perhaps both school boards).
3. A plan should be developed for control of the schools. The logical arrangement would be the typical consolidation plan with a single board answering to the parishes involved and requiring the approval of the sponsoring parishes for subsidy amounts in the budget.

* *Catholic Schools and Racial Integration: Perspectives, Directions, Models* (Washington, D.C: The National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice, September, 1977), pp. 46-62.

4. Some preliminary thought must go to the financing. Very substantial increases in the costs (e.g. for transportation or new services) would endanger the proposal. So also could the concern that partnership with a weak parish might threaten a school's viability.
5. Transportation plans should be made at least to the point where assurances could be given that attendance under the new arrangement would not be impossible or highly inconvenient.
6. Some thought should be given to other possible objections and questions that are likely to be raised. Among these might be:
   a. Those that relate to stereotypes: "Black kids use dope" . . . "White kids have sex parties" . . . "White parents are rich and will create unfair comparisons by my kids" . . .
   b. Those that relate to peer support: "My kids don't want to leave their friends" . . . "Why should my kids be used as pawns?" . . .
   c. Those that relate to public school integration: "Why are we trying to ape another public school idea that isn't working?" . . . "Isn't it true that the public schools are spending all their time just trying to keep discipline?" . . .

B. Selling the Idea

1. A number of different groups would need to be "sold" on the concept. Each one will have slightly different concerns, but for each one we must be prepared to respond to, "What's in it for me?" and to answer objections they will raise.

   Those groups begin with the leadership, whose enthusiasm (not just support) is essential: pastors, parish staffs, principals. Then come school faculties, followed by parish leadership groups: school board or education committee and parish council. Parents and students are the key to acceptance. The final groups are the entire parish communities.
2. Two selling bases will be necessary: the theological reasons for integration and the educational reasons for the plan. The latter should be based on the importance and richness of the intercultural experience, but should also lean heavily on the benefits of particular components of the educational plan.
3. Parish leadership will be the first and most important of the "salespersons." It is also necessary to persuade on a person-to-person level, involving the parents and probably also the students. The fundraising strategy of recruiting the most important contributors as solicitors probably has a valid parallel in that the most concerned and articulate parents and students will make the most effective proponents of an integration proposal.

C. Preparing for integration in the particular school involved

1. To begin implementing an integration plan, faculties can break the ice with some joint activities. These might include:
   a. Joint faculty meetings for discussion of general educational philosophies, theology as to race, sharing concerns and eventually some joint planning.
   b. Visits to each other's schools and to integrated schools whose experience might be useful.
   c. Class exchanges, taking each other's places for a day now and then.

2. Joint activities should be scheduled for students. Each class could share field trips, exchange visits, and join in service projects. They might share a team (or two) in some sport, attend class together to learn a new skill or to share a summer day camp experience.
3. A plan could be phased in over two or three years. Either parish would have the option of dropping out if the early steps raised difficulties that could not be satisfactorily worked out. Possible steps:

   Year 1—Joint activities: faculties and students; occasional joint board meetings; planning activities; broad parish consultation.

   Year 2—Continuation of Year 1 activities with addition of student exchange days and transition to a single school board.

   Year 3—Full consolidation with provision for evaluation and optional reversal of the decision.

Getting Started

The process must begin with the willingness of the pastors, parish staffs and principals to examine the possibilities and to remain open to where that process might lead.

Parish leadership should use opportunities to catechize the parishes on the theological dimensions of race and culture. (Central Office could be helpful in assembling useful background materials for this.) This should include not only appropriate homilies, but use of teaching moments with various groups in the parish. The occasion of public school integration presents many opportunities but they tend to be permeated with emotional overtones. The better part of wisdom lies in declining to take sides on such matters as the merits of "forced busing", but instead addressing the level of principle—the dignity of the human person, the need to be aware of institutional injustice, our responsibility to be our borther's keeper, the richness that is brought to the Church and the human family by the diversity of races and cultures, etc. This, of course, does not preclude urging respect for the law as a keystone of society and urging cooperation to help the public schools make court ordered plans work for the children's sake.

Clandestine planning for Catholic school integration should be avoided. At an early stage, when the leadership has begun to feel comfortable with the idea, it is possible to say in complete truth, "The integration of our Catholic school with our neighboring parish's school may not be feasible but we would like to investigate its potential value to our children." At this point, then, it is possible to proceed with initial planning and to design and begin the consultation process which to the end will be part selling and part listening.

Lessons from Public School Desegregation

by Meyer Weinberg

It has been almost 25 years, a quarter of a century, since the *Brown* decision, the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling that segregated education is unconstitutional. On the night of May 17th, 1954, Constance Motley, a black attorney for the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, was asked by a colleague of hers to fill in at a speaking engagement to a black group in Alabama. She was expecting that the black people in that small town would be dancing in the streets at the news of *Brown*, but she was shocked to find that while they knew about it, they were not excited in the least. Certainly there was no dancing in the streets.

I would say that there still is no dancing in the streets. When W.E.B. DuBois commented just a week after the 1954 decision, he said he had not thought he would live to see it. (He was a mere 80 or so then with another 15 years to go.) He warned that there would be certain losses involved for black people, "While we have to welcome it, it's undoubtedly going to be the case, our best teachers will be fired from the integrated schools." And he was quite right; not only teachers, but principals as well.

He also said that the teaching of black culture and black history would decline in the newly desegregated public schools. This time he was wrong, because there is much more teaching of those subjects in the public schools today than 24 years ago.

So, we can greet May 17th, 1954, perhaps with only two cheers. Much of its promise is still only a promise. **The first lesson we can take from the public schools is that even though there is far more desegregation than ever before in our history there are also, at least in the North, more segregated schools than ever before.** How can you have both? The gross number of children attending schools has expanded. But the main direction is clear—it is in the direction of greater desegregation.

The Impetus for Desegregation

The second lesson of the last 24 years in public schools is that the black people have always constituted the strongest force for desegregation and still are today. In the absence of agitation by blacks, either through the courts, in communities, or in demonstrations, desegregation would merely be a theoretical topic for scholastic study, and could not be a social reality. Not only support but the leadership of the school desegregation movement has been black from the beginning.

The impetus for desegregation has never come from the public school leadership and has never come from the schools of education, which were white, lily-white, and largely still are today. It has not come from the state education authorities, nor from Federal education authorities. It has come from organized black people.

Continuing support for desegregation comes in different forms today. For example, where schools are already desegregated, and black people have a chance to express a political opinion, they have virtually always strongly supported its continuation. In Pasadena, where there have been two recall elections for school board members, the black community has voted heavily—around 80 to 90 percent—in favor of the desegregation candidates.

This is also true in Milwaukee, where there are inequities in the desegregation plan. Yet, last September the black community rejected a call from a small group within the black community to boycott the schools, in opposition to the inequity of one-way busing of black children. Note therefore, there are different strains within the black community. While it is not monolithic, the historic reality seems to be strongly on the side of desegregation.

In those cities where desegregation has not yet occurred but a court order is impending or hearings are being held on the proper remedy (for instance, Los Angeles and Cleveland), the organized black community has aggressively supported a sweeping desegregation plan rather than a small-scale one.

In Fort Wayne, the black community was so bitter at the proposal for one-way busing of black children into white schools and the closing down of at least one black school, for no apparent reason, except to "protect" the white children, they negotiated a settlement in court. Now there is to be no busing, no desegregation in the short-run. Indications are that they are very much devoted to the idea of desegregation, but they are so dead-set against a lopsided plan, that they will hold off on desegregation until they can get a fair system.

There are separatist sentiments in the black community, but you have to look far and wide to find them. They can be found among younger people in their late teens to early 20's especially. When you look at their material condition, the unemployment, the extraordinarily poor schooling they've experienced, it is very easy to understand those sentiments. Also, certain sectors of the well-educated, middle-class professional black group are separatists, especially those who find themselves dealing with black clientele or customers.

Overall then, the historic black commitment to desegregation continues, albeit not unanimously and certainly not without its ups and downs, depending on particular events.

Whose Problem?

School desegregation is a school problem, not merely a social problem is the third lesson. That has become clear but perhaps not clear enough, since we hear people say: "Why load the responsibility for desegregation onto the children? Let the adults solve it." However, this is contrary to the historic development of the American public school system. If you read that history, you will find that the school people enthusiastically helped segregate the schools.

The historical documents are virtually devoid of evidence of resistance by the school leadership to the movement toward segregation in either the South or the the North. It's very clear, after studying the history, that school segregation is not something that was foisted on unwilling school leaders. Quite the contrary. We have shameful cases, even before the Civil War, for example in Ohio, of a school law which said that if a "vicious person" or other such person is allowed to attend class, the teacher will not be obeyed. Teachers, therefore, feared lawsuits by parents. In some cases the white parents said that a black child in that classroom was a "depraved" or a "vicious person" and had to be taken out of the classroom. Otherwise, public funds could not be used to support that school. Teachers, principals and others were only too eager to enforce such laws. Thus, millions of children have been forced to pay a price in poor education because of so-called social considerations, except those social considerations were pro-segregation.

It is interesting that there is so little research on parochial schools, and that tells me the same thing. Apparently the people who ran the parochial schools, at least in Chicago, did not resist. (I'm speaking of people down the line, classroom teachers and principals.) A dissertation written at Loyola University in 1973 on the history of the education of black children in Chicago's parochial schools stated that Cardinal Mundelein deliberately segregated the parochial schools of Chicago in the 1920's. The Chicago school board was of course doing the same thing; the two systems marched together in the same direction. There is no evidence of any major resistance.

The result was that black children, in most cases, ended up with miserable schools. The more privileged black children, however, like the more privileged white children, always managed to get some kind of education. This is an important lesson also, from the public and the parochial schools.

Constitutional Base

The fourth lesson (but I must admit, this is a lesson only I seem to have learned, so I readily grant that it may not really be a lesson, but my own prejudice) **is that Catholic schools will get nowhere in seeking substantial amounts of public funds unless and until they are able to change the basis of their constitutional argument.** Thus far, the argument in several court cases has revolved around the first amendment. I believe a much more productive argument would revolve around the 14th amendment. *Catholic Schools and Racial Integration*, published in 1977 by NCCIJ, has a chapter by Marie Guillory, Esq. on the 14th amendment, in which she argues that the Catholic schools are already included under the 14th amendment and may be sued under it, since parochial schools fulfill a state purpose, are in effect agents of the State and are funded by, or otherwise partly dependent, on State involvement.

What would the Supreme Court or other Federal Court say if it were presented with a plan whereby both elementary and high schools, public and parochial, would be included within a single desegregation plan? The precise relationship of parochial schools to the public schools would fall somewhere along a continuum. On one end, there is simply shared time and at the other end, merger. Somewhere along this continuum, it might be possible to create a working partnership between the parochial and the public schools, where both are desegregated at the same time.

In other words, where the parochial schools actually help enforce the 14th Amendment, what would a Federal court say? I don't know that the court is ready to say that one amendment is more important than another. The court has spoken many times on the "preferred" freedoms and some are more fundamental than others. Whether the 14th amendment's equal protection of the law is more important than the first amendment's separation of church and state, is an interesting question. I would not predict how a court would rule on it, nor do I know of any court that has been asked to rule on it.

I believe that the 14th amendment is increasingly the keystone in the search for legal equality. Therefore, it is time to search out a positive constitutional argument, rather than to spend time trying to prove that the first amendment does not forbid state aid. In other words, there is a price that the Catholic schools would have to pay, but in my opinion it would be a price that would be worth it.

Class and Racist Society

Another lesson we must learn is that American society is a class-ridden society in which all those things conventionally defined as good, such as housing, education, health care, are heavily influenced by class. Father Fitzpatrick referred to "our common life." (See "Catholic Schools and Racial Integration," above.) He spoke in terms of "they" becoming ready to enter "our" culture and society. I am a little in doubt as to how common our "common life" is because it is so influenced by class.

Not only is ours a class society, it is also a racist society. Certain groups in our society are subjected to a special disadvantage because of their race and ethnic condition: blacks, Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, Indian-Americans and Asian-Americans. These are the only groups subjected to official segregation and discrimination in the United States. By "official," I mean conscious, deliberate, statutory, executive or judicial action. This is not to deny that many other groups have suffered from informal social or economic discrimination. I remember my father, who was a good carpenter, telling of applying for a job at a certain Chicago building. He couldn't get work because as the boss told him, "No Jews hired." He was not a bitter man, by the way, but he simply lived with that harsh memory. That is real discrimination; it hurts as much as official discrimination. But it is not what I'm talking about.

If we're talking about public policy, we should hesitate to speak of our "common life," by equating all groups willy nilly, without, in fact, examining the actual way of life in America. Ours is not a pluralist society, we have yet to become one although it is a worthy goal. But to represent our society as already pluralist, where groups are equally respected, is a major distortion of the social reality, an unfortunate reality, but the reality nonetheless.

If we don't recognize that, then it is very difficult to justify any kind of affirmative action program. We need affirmative action as a public policy because it was the heavy hand of public policy that previously enforced inequality, official inequality, approved and blessed by the U.S. Supreme Court. Within a three year span, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that segregation is constitutional, 1896 in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* ("Separate but equal" ruling), and, in the *Cumming* ruling, 1899, the same court unanimously ruled that deliberate deprivation of a minority in schools is also constitutional. Under this ruling a school board in Augusta, Georgia closed down a black high school. It was very unusual at that time to have a black public high school in the South, but it was closed and the money was used to keep the white one open. The black parents sued on the basis of equal protection of the law, the 14th amendment. This was the first school case decision by the Supreme Court on that issue, and against integration.

The court held that this was not a deprivation of equal protection of the law, so that within three years at the end of the 19th century, the highest court in the country blessed both segregation and deliberate deprivation. That is at least part of the reason why a public policy today of affirmative action is a very basic act of justice. It is not because there are some sociologists on the Supreme Court, and it is not because there is a mangling of the 14th amendment underway. It is because fundamentally we should compensate for so much official injustice. To speak of pluralism under those conditions is to misue the word.

Once we have done away with racism, then there will be time enough to speak of pluralism. We cannot achieve pluralism by enunciating it. There are some concrete things that have to be done first.

Curriculum

Another lesson is what I call the curriculum of anti-racism. I visited a Race Relations Institute in Florida run by the Department of Defense that supposedly was really doing a job against racism. The classes and the reading materials were very militant and self-conscious from an ethnic and racial point of view. The materials were sympathetic to minorities; some were most radical.

Only afterwards did I realize what was most striking about this Institute: There wasn't a single class or reading on racism in the Army. It was racism in the schools, racism in employment, racism in the courts, racism here, racism there but nothing on racism in the Army, Navy or Air Force. In other words, they were talking about somebody else's racism.

Recently I was talking to a group of teachers brought together primarily by the Teacher's Union in Cleveland. They are under court order. The precise terms of this order are not final, but are to be put into effect in September. I suggested that they pay a great deal of attention to the curriculum and not just see desegregation as physically shifting kids around. Although that may be essential, it's not enough.

The text of the Judge Battisti ruling on segregation in the Cleveland schools strikes me, as an old history teacher, as one of the best readings available. The Judge cited over 200 instances of deliberate discrimination by the Cleveland school board and wrote one of the toughest findings in the judicial literature of desegregation. The judge's opinion details how the Cleveland school system became segregated deliberately. (As part of his ruling, Judge Battisti asked Daniel

McCarthy, his Special Master, to examine the financial practices of the school board. You couldn't find a better textbook for explaining certain accounting procedures and problems in misuse of public funds than from these documented reports.)

So if you're going to talk about desegregating parochial schools, don't look at somebody else's racism. Examine your own. If we are going to help others we must be willing to examine ourselves. If desegregation is just empty rhetoric we should stay the way we are. It will save a lot of trouble. We have got to reexamine our own practices, if we are in fact really preparing to change them. I think that's an important part of any curriculum.

Quality of Education

Still another lesson is the relationship between what is called "quality education" and what I would call "first-rate education." Now the cry for quality education in the minority areas in the country means something very specific. It means "you have not been teaching our children even the most elementary skills, and we insist that whatever else you try to do, you must do that first."

I recall, back in Chicago in the early '60's, when the civil rights movement was very much alive, one of the main demands we made was that the Chicago school board publish achievement scores, school by school. Oh, how they resisted that! The Teacher's Union also resisted it, right along with the Board. It would embarrass the schools; it would embarrass the children. Of course, we thought it would mostly embarrass the Board to find out how backward the system was in teaching the most elementary skills.

We thought also, more broadly, that once the newspapers published these figures, there would be a widespread shock by the citizenry and they would arise and demand that the schools change their practices and become more effective. Well, we won that battle. Both Chicago newspapers now print the scores for Chicago schools. Other cities that have scores printed are New York, Los Angeles and Miami.

However, in 1972, the *Miami Times*, a black newspaper, asked, "why don't we stop publishing those figures?" I found that curious—after fighting so hard to get that information published.why should we stop it?The editor explained that the publication of the scores had nothing to do with changing the situation. It had become a game—the white parents look at the black scores and say, "Oh, thank God, our kids don't go to those schools." And the black parents say, "If only our kids could attend the other schools."

In other words, the existing situation has come to be accepted as the norm. Whatever is, is right—at least in the white schools. And so the situation has been redefined. "If only all schools were as successful as the white schools, how marvelous that would be." But you and I know that's not true.

The research director of the Urban League in Chicago at that time, said, "In Chicago, black kids get a third-class education. White kids get a second-class education. No one really gets a first-class education." That has not changed, except that now we have come to accept the publication of scores which are shocking, especially to parents. But they are accepted as educational epitaphs. "Here lie Johnny and Joan, times 200,000. They can't read. They can't write. Tough." Let's publish next year's scores one year from now.

From that background, it's very easy to see how the cry for "quality education" is a cry for minimal achievement—reading, writing and arithmetic. But in the end, it is a delusion because as long as the schools are segregated, minority and poor white children will not get a decent education, at least not in the public schools. The public schools do not educate poor and minority children unless the minority children are middle-class. But if, at the same time that we desegregate, we rededicate ourselves to a "first-rate education" for every child, then we are at least putting that matter on the agenda of the public schools. It is not on the agenda right now.

I have been unsuccessful in getting reading scores by race from the parochial schools. If somebody has them, please give them to me—for any city. I keep a file which is open to everyone. People from all over have referred to it and found it helpful. I have been able to get rather easily a race count in Chicago's diocese, but I have not been able to get reading scores for schools or for individual students by race. I wonder to what extent there is any difference, that is, what is the differ-difference in the disparate situation between white and black children or minority children in the public schools on the one hand, and in the parochial schools on the other.

Voluntarism—The Public Schools

The public schools offer another lesson on voluntarism, voluntary desegregation. What have we learned about voluntary desegregation in the public schools? First, voluntarism is a very attractive principle, it means that parents of children make a free choice, and all of that is very pleasant to hear, as a principle. The question is, how has it worked thus far in the public schools?

Voluntary desegregation has been most successful in the public schools when it concerned a single school. One of the best examples is in Richardson, Texas, a suburb of Dallas. There are 12 schools altogether, one all black or substantially minority was converted into a magnet school which drew some white students from the other schools. It is now substantially a desegregated school, and it seems to be working well.

Mark Twain Junior High School, Coney Island, New York is another example of a successful school. Originally the Federal Court ordered a sweeping desegregation process upon finding deliberate segregation. Then an excellent and insightful judge reversed the order and made Mark Twain a magnet school. The administrators consider it a success.

The Walt Disney School in Chicago is also a successful magnet school. The school population is chosen by computer from a volunteer list to achieve an ethnic and economic mix. All the children are bused, even if they live a few blocks away. This school has achieved an ideal—it is both a good school and has been successfully desegregated.

But if we look into the rest of Dallas, or New York City or Chicago it is too clear that one good magnet school has no significance for the rest of a giant city.

Another group of cities have tried to desegregate, or say they are desegregating the whole city by voluntary means. However, their performance doesn't live up to their talk. Look at the reports of the magnet schools in Buffalo—these are schools that families chose voluntarily for their children to attend. By and large these schools have worked out as planned except for the difficulties in attracting

enough white children—a problem shared by all voluntarily desegregated schools. But representatives of this school system state that the system has now been desegregated by voluntary means. Yet 16 schools, virtually all minority, are not even in the program. This confirms my point that as long as a school system is segregated, as it still is in Buffalo, you cannot speak truthfully of city-wide voluntary desegregation even though the system has a large-scale voluntary desegregation program.

Next, look at Milwaukee. The federal court ordered one third of the system desegregated each year for a three year period. Now at the end of the second year, the future remains unclear because of an appeal in the courts. This is what they have achieved so far by "voluntary" means: Some black schools were closed and others were declared overcrowded. The black children from these schools were given a choice of five or six other schools to attend. They had no alternative but to leave their old schools. That is called voluntary.

The resultant ratio of children bused in Milwaukee is something like 90 percent black to ten percent white. This seems to lack essential elements of voluntary compliance.

If parents didn't assert their right to choose a specific school the school board assigned their children at its convenience. Again the largest proportion of assigned students were black.

The Milwaukee plan has a considerable one-way element which is unjust. Most of the black parents, apparently, have felt that they have gained so much from the desegregation that they are going to stick with it. But there is quite a bit of discomfort, to say the least, among the parents with that kind of voluntarism.

There is no school system that has desegregated voluntarily. In fact, there is probably not a city in the entire United States where more than five, six or seven seven percent of the public schools have been desegregated voluntarily. The assistant superintendent of schools of Houston was telling parents how much money the city had spent publicizing the success of its voluntary magnet schools plan. Yet it is a very tiny thing—touching about four and a half percent of all the children and involving only about 48 schools in the whole city.

He said that he believed they're not going to have more than 60—it is terribly expensive to have these special magnets. It looks as if we are at the end of that adventure in voluntary desegregation. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit recently disapproved the Dallas plan which is largely based on voluntary desegregation. The court said you have got to address the total problem. Dallas had taken one third of the school system, which is heavily black and Chicano,and kept it out of the desegregation plan. The court said you cannot do that without compelling justification.

Voluntarism—The Catholic Schools

What does this all mean for the Catholic schools? Catholic schools are already voluntary, so to speak of making them more voluntary has no meaning. **My final lesson is that the only way that the Catholic schools can become really desegregated is by diminishing the voluntary aspect.**

How you do this is your problem, but one direction is to explore again a possible hook up with the public school system. This would enable you to keep

intact your historic framework of voluntary schools based on neighborhood parishes. Although it is hard to see how Catholic schools can be successful in desegregation unless the voluntary element of the system is adjusted in some way. Otherwise the Catholic schools will be doing what the schools in Houston or Milwaukee or Buffalo are doing: Perpetuating a new form of tokenism, which is not what we mean by justice.

Research

The Catholic schools desperately need research, even though research does not necessarily lead to action. Nevertheless, where there is virtually nothing being done, something ought to be done.

As I mentioned earlier, I have been collecting a file on race in the schools for every state in the United States (I appointed myself as a scribe for the movement years ago). You are all welcome to use my files—they are extensive. What you will find is a little treasure trove of material from newspaper clippings to doctoral dissertations, covering the past 15 years, but very little on racial factors in Catholic schools. Even our own magazine, *Integrateducation*, now in its 15th annual volume has carried only three articles on the subject, and those before 1968: Dennis Clark's "Color and Conscience in the Classroom," an article on segregation in one of the Catholic schools in the District of Columbia by Jane Berdes, and a reprint on Catholic school desegregation in Milwaukee by Sharon Gelder, education editor of the *Chicago Reporter*.

In researching my book, *A Chance to Learn*, I discovered an excellent book written in 1958 on racial factors in Catholic colleges. There are others: a dissertation in Chicago, and more works just coming out. As you can see, the literature is new and the quantity is small.

There is much work to be done, challenging to people who are less activists, more academic, enjoying research. The research base can be broadened by dissertations and by research of Catholic organizations, carefully motivated to include the adverse as well as the favorable. We need much more independent research, much more research in general.

We also need comparative research on the public and the Catholic schools, which I think would be very revealing of some fundamental inadequacies in American life. I have touched upon only nine "lessons." I think there are dozens more. I've stayed away from the classroom in this case, because I believe we don't get away enough from the classroom. We must back up and get a larger perspective. But of course, as a lifelong teacher, I know the classroom is where the final action is.

Catholic Schools and Public School Desegregation

by Brigid Griffin, C.S.J.

Introduction

Sharing in the overwhelming task of preparing the large, industrial city of Cleveland for the desegregation of its public schools is a constant challenge for any person. Engaging in this effort as a religious woman and as a representative of the Catholic diocese has had many specific challenges.

Among the common questions I've received are: "How can you talk to parents about children when you haven't any?" "What are Catholic schools doing about themselves?" "Your whole church is white so why are you talking about equality with blacks?" "You Catholics have your own schools; what right have you got to talk about public school kids and desegregation?" or "I'm a Catholic; I give to my Church; why can't I put my kids in Catholic school whenever I want to?" Questions such as these force one to think about how we are perceived by those who are not members of the Catholic Church as well as how we and other Catholics perceive our Catholic schools and understand our faith.

In this paper I'd like to reflect on one aspect of my experience as program coordinator for the Bishop's Committee on School Desegregation. That aspect is the relationship of Catholic schools to a public school system that is implementing a desegregation process.

Too often I hear Catholic school personnel expressing disbelief that the public schools will ever be desegregated without violence and destruction, then sighing with a proportionate sense of relief that they are glad it's not *their* problem. And so, we can easily slip back into a safe, lifeless, ghetto mentality and let the rest of the city solve its own problems.

I've heard often from Christian lips the un-Christian cry, "What is the state doing to help us?" "Why should we care now?" "Let them take care of their own problems!" and "Nobody helped my ancestors when they migrated to the United States. Let the blacks pull themselves up by their bootstraps the same way my parents did." Thereis a whole litany of examples of discrimination and stereotypes with which we are all familiar.

More and more I've been forced to think about the Church's position on the desegregation of public schools, the role of the Catholic school in the process, and to question the validity of Catholic schools which are largely school communities whose members are of one race.

I offer you, then, my reflections on my own experience and some of the possible activity I think we must engage in as leaders in Catholic education at this time in the United States. I feel that these remarks, though precipitated by my working under a court-ordered desegregation process, apply equally to the Catholic schools in a city that is not under such a stricture. In fact, people not under the emotional trauma of the court order should have fewer problems examining their Catholic schools and the completeness of their educational program if racially isolated than those people in a situation such as Cleveland's.

The Cleveland Experience

Towards the end of 1973, a class action suit was filed in Cleveland, Ohio, known today as *Reed* v. *Rhodes*. On November 4, 1974 the Bishop of Cleveland, James A. Hickey, sent to the Cleveland clergy a statement on desegregation that set " . . . the moral parameters within which a Catholic must approach the solution to this difficult problem."[1]

The statement was released with the hope that " . . . when a decision does come with regard to our community's approach to the solution of this problem, our priests and people will be ready to show the moral leadership the gospel enjoins upon them."[2]

The statement reads:

> The people of Greater Cleveland are conscious of an impending lawsuit which directly involves racial justice. The issues which it raises have moral as well as educational and civic dimensions. The Court must judge the facts.
>
> The Bishops of the United States have spoken out forcefully and repeatedly concerning racial discrimination.
>
> "We insist that the heart of the race question is moral and religious. It concerns the rights of man and our attitude toward our fellow man . . . Discrimination based on the accidental fact of race or color . . . cannot be reconciled with the truth that God has created all men with equal rights and equal dignity." (On Racial Harmony Joint Pastoral Letter of the Bishops of the United States—1963).
>
> We reaffirm the basic moral judgment.
>
> Whatever may be the outcome of the pending suit, the decision must be obeyed. Our interest in this situation goes much further than merely keeping the law. Equality of educational opportunity is not only a matter of law or of court order. It is a matter of conscience.
>
> In fidelity to the spirit and message of the Gospel, we must clearly address ourselves to all issues that are possible violations of love and justice in society. When any person of one race, creed, sex, or socioeconomic group is discriminated against by another, all suffer.
>
> The Diocese of Cleveland, its schools, its agencies, and its resources stand ready to work positively and cooperatively with other groups in the community in finding the best solutions to the challenges presented.[3]

The case of *Reed* v. *Rhodes* was heard between November 24, 1975, and March 9, 1976. During the period after trial, waiting for the court's decision, the bishop

prepared a set of guidelines for Catholic schools to be used in the event the court found the Cleveland school system liable. However, intimation of these guidelines found their way prematurely into the media. The bishop, therefore, communicated both his view on the situation and the guidelines to the Cleveland clergy sooner than he had planned. In these communications he wrote:

> Whatever the decision of the Court, it must be our task as leaders in the Church Community to use all suitable means to remedy the evil of segregation and to erase from our Diocese all evidences of racial discrimination.
>
> In November of last year I . . . stressed that this issue was not merely one of school administration, but was a matter of basic moral and religious judgment.
>
> The Catholic schools of the Diocese of Cleveland have historically been open to all children whose parents desired for them a Catholic education. . . .
>
> However, if we are to be true to the message of Jesus, we must seek to avoid situations where those schools are used in violation of love and justice.
>
> I call upon all of you . . . to assist in the implementation of the enclosed policy and guidelines. I ask our pastors and principals to follow these policies carefully so that the Catholic schools of the Diocese of Cleveland will not become havens for those trying to circumvent racial desegregation in their public schools.[4]

The "Guidelines for School Admission" set forth a policy of not contributing to "segregation based on race or color"[5] and laid down the outline of a process whereby the pastor and the principal would have the responsibility "to determine with moral certitude that the admission request is motivated by reasons other than to avoid the racial desegregation of the students' former schools."[6]

These guidelines were re-affirmed and re-issued on March 6, 1978. While it is true that no one can control completely human process, I think we would have to admit that the one percent rise in the Catholic school population is a good indication that there were earnest efforts made to follow the guidelines. The bishop's leadership has been very significant in this respect and has been one affirmative action for the stability of both Catholic and public schools in Cleveland.

On August 31, 1976, the FederalCourt handed down a decision of liability and an order to plan a remedy. To list the events and crises that have intervened since that date would perhaps be interesting but would not serve the purpose of this paper. Suffice it to say that the city's public school personnel were desegregated in fall of 1977, and that an order of February 6, 1978, set in motion planning for desegregating Cleveland public school pupils in September of 1978.

In response, on May 24, 1977, the bishop announced to school principals:

> As our city continues to plan for the peaceful implementation of the court order, I believe it is appropriate for us to adopt further affirmative action responses. . . .
>
> It is incumbent on all of us to work diligently to bring an end to the racism in our society. Hopefully, the children in our schools will be able to eradicate this evil in their lifetime. These proposed steps to an integrated education will assist in that process.[7]

Then followed the formal statement of the affirmative action recommendations:

1. Principals and pastors are encouraged to hire minority teachers and paraprofessionals where these individuals possess the same religious values and

beliefs as the school may otherwise require of other teachers and paraprofessionals.

2. The school curriculum and environment should provide for a knowledge and appreciation of various racial and ethnic cultures by instruction and experiential opportunities.
3. When space is available, Catholic schools are encouraged to accept the enrollment of minority students, at the specified entry grades, in conformity with existing guidelines.[8]

At present these affirmative responses seem not to have altered the Cleveland Catholic schools in any visibly significant way. Some faculties have discussed them; a few principals have staff working on acquiring textbooks that do not discriminate. Very little has been done to recruit minority personnel or to increase the number of pupils from minority groups.

Another Church-sponsored activity was going on simultaneously with these efforts in the Catholic schools. In Spring of 1976, the Bishop's Committee on School Desegregation (BCSD) was formed. It included fifty persons representative of various organizations and ethnic groups in the Cleveland Church. After months of education on the topic of public school desegregation, these people decided it was of critical importance that they find the means to share their insights with the Catholic community of the Greater Cleveland area. An office was established to coordinate these efforts in the belief that accurate information and understanding would help to create a peaceful, non-violent citizenry when the time for implementation came to the city's public schools.

At the time of the liability decision, more than 50,000 Catholic children were attending Cleveland public schools. (The total student population of the Cleveland public schools in 1976 was 122,706.)[9] These children and their parents were a primary concern for the programs of the BCSD because they were the Catholics who would be directly involved in the school desegregation process. By Spring of 1978, we had moderate success in communicating with these students and their parents.

However, I would have to admit that we have had less success in facing this whole issue with students, their parents and the faculties of our Catholic schools. This is not to say that nothing has happened in the Catholic school community.

The BCSD has conducted programs on racial segregation and desegregation for:

Faculties of Catholic Schools 12
Classes or Groups of Catholic School Students 15
(Of these, 5 were of high school age)
Parent-Teacher Groups of Catholic Schools 12

Throughout the city individual educators—religious men and women, lay men and women, as well as priests with experience in informative programs on desegregation—are working to promote understanding and a Christian response in the youth and adults they meet in educational situations.

An educative program was offered for the staff of our diocesan education office. A presentation was given in December 1976, for the Catholic High School Principal's Association; this consisted primarily of an overview of the services and materials available to them and their school communities through the Bishop's Committee.

Several congregations of religious women in the diocese have large numbers of sisters teaching in Cleveland diocesan schools. Some of these congregations offered several in-depth sessions on school desegregation to their members and to other school staff.

I think it is apparent to you that I see one of the relationships of Catholic schools to public schools during desegregation to be that of understanding. Knowledge and understanding of the whole issue of public school desegregation are essential to faculty, parents and students in the Catholic school community if we hope to find Catholic people interacting in a Christian way.

If principals and administrative staff in Catholic schools are going to perform in a rational and Christian manner, they must know what is at stake in the desegregation of their public schools and how this affects them.

Children attending Catholic schools in a city whose public schools are desegregating can be the name-callers and the stone-throwers at their playmates or they can be helpful, supportive, fun-loving neighbors to their playmates and to their "new" neighbors as well. For this to happen Catholic teachers must have provided time for the children to learn and talk about desegregation and plan their actions among their public school peers. The older the students, the more imperative this need becomes.

For these kinds of Christian education for the present life situation, strong, clear leadership is needed at all levels of the school administration.

One of the most powerful methods we use to form Christian character in our schools is prayer. I would suggest to you that to talk with students and then lead them to pray about desegregation is a Catholic school activity that costs us little in time and effort but brings immeasurable results; namely, the grace and power of God working in hearts and minds; the conscious development of a Christian mentality in the mind and heart of the pray-er; and the growing realization of the complexity and demands of the living out of our faith.

I see the office of school superintendent supplying prayer suggestions and helps to teachers at every grade level as well as openly encouraging or requiring prayer as a significant part of Catholic school participation in a community whose public schools are desegregating.

A secondary kind of supportive activity is often possible for Catholic schools and that is to make available the school facilities as a neutral meeting place for community needs. For example, some ways our buildings may be used to assist a local community include:

1) hosting a community "welcome" luncheon or tea for the newly assigned teachers to neighboring public schools.
2) providing meeting places for small groups of parents and/or students from paired to clustered public school communities.
3) meetings for parent and teacher groups from the nearby public school(s) to gather for information before the process of desegregation is implemented.
4) during implementation to offer to share our facility with safety and peace keeping personnel for coffeebreaks or rest periods or a temporary first aid center(s).

In each locale, the specific elements of the process and other particular factors

will offer their own variety of such kinds of supportive activity to Catholic schools.

There may be other ways in which Catholic schools can be supportive to their public school counterparts. It is possible that schools could be encouraged to free up one or two (or more) staff persons during the initial days of desegregation to assist in the peacekeeping and safety efforts in the community. They may be freed up to man rumor control or information phones for the public school authorities. These ideas are merely to suggest that each situation will develop its own kind of needs for which Catholic school personnel and facilities can perform direct support roles.

Implications for Catholic Schools

I would like to look now at some more significant aspects of desegregation for us as Catholic educators. In well over one hundred meetings which I have conducted on school desegregation, whatever the age, religion, sex, profession or economic situation of the participants, the first questions asked have been "What about the Catholic schools?" "What are they doing?"

I know the glib and legally accurate answer is that we are not involved in the court action or in the situation of the public school system. Where we are fortunate to have Church leadership that has taken a clear and strong stand we can cite that too, and even indicate the affirmative action that has been encouraged by such leaders. But all of this becomes more and more like sounding brass as we address ourselves to the advantages of integrated education in the city of Cleveland.

Some of the areas that have often been discussed by youth, by parents and by educators are:

- the incompleteness of a racially isolated education to prepare youngsters for the adult world they will live in;
- the rich opportunities that are open to children who develop a healthy self-esteem and an openness to the diversity of other persons that allows them to understand and respect all human beings as persons worthy of esteem and care;
- the harm done by an isolated life and educational experience because of the prejudice (and sometimes, bigotry) that is unconsciously acquired by children who may later spend years undoing the effects of such an experience, or may live out their lives with very narrow limitations on themselves and their life experience.

Desegregation of public schools demands of us a shouldering of a new responsibility: to evaluate honestly and to reconstruct creatively our religious educational heritage; to examine the extensive teachings of the Church on justice and prejudice and to restructure our schools so that these teachings find practical, experiential application in the educational life of our Catholic youth and provide a visible witness to those outside of our schools.

This immediately produces a vision, at least for me, of the need to develop simultaneously a Catholic adult world that will not only understand and believe the Faith as we teach it but will support and encourage the application of Christian values to daily life. This means that we begin to move away from values such as excessive individualism, competitiveness and violence, personal com-

fort, "status" determined by race, by job, or by possessions and impersonal, private, uninvolved life styles. It means, among other things, that we begin to turn around our convenience centered culture towards becoming a person-in-God centered culture whose values include appreciation for persons of diverse races as part of the common unity of humanity; a careful use of the gifts and resources of nature by and for all people; cooperation and mutual concern; and a belief in the richness of a truly pluralistic society.

I know that parents and adult Catholics are not in your schools. I know, too, that this kind of Christian development is the responsibilityof the whole Church community. However, you as Catholic educators have a responsibility through and in the schools to involve parents in the educational process of their children. There are many effective ways to do this; and you know them. Do you encourage them? Do you hold principals and teachers accountable for employing such methods?

Beyond the school job you hold, I think you have the opportunity as educators to minister to the adult community as any other adult Christian. Can't you be part of Catholic groups as a challenger, an initiator, calling forth the creativity of adult Catholics? I can't believe that we have no creativity in a Church that glories in the power and freedom of the Spirit at work in men and women endowed as all persons with imagination and intelligence!

As an educator I've experienced that, although we preach and sing "community," we too often fail to see ourselves as members of that community. Because of some bit of professionalism, we psychologically sit outside of the community to nurture, advise, evaluate or direct it. We don't let ourselves be just ourselves (—another Alice or Jack, not "Father" or "Sister" or "Doctor"—) and share at the level of our everyday lives of work, prayer or relaxation. It is in this setting that a Catholic educator ministers to the adult community in a very influential way.

In the area of racial understanding you have a decisive role to perform in the gentle but firm pressure you can bring to bear on the personnel in your schools. As an educational leader you can provide the opportunities as well as the motivation of Catholic school personnel to:

- experience anti-racism workshops
- be trained to offer multi-racial, multi-cultural curricula
- evaluate and to change the kinds of testing, tracking and counselling that students are subjected to when these are prejudiced towards one race or culture
- provide models for children of racially and culturally diverse adults working together as a harmonious school staff
- set up committees to carefully examine textbooks being used and to use only those that do not discriminate against minority people in either content or art, by inclusion or exclusion.

It is certainly within our capability in Catholic schools to plan for our students' curricular and extra-curricular experiences that are racially diverse. Such programs offer educators the opportunities to develop healthy human relationships. Often it is possible to include parents or other parish members in ancillary roles in these interracial activities. There is a decided advantage to children if such programs involve the same groups of students in a continual exchange so that

friendships can form and values can develop over a period of time, with shared experiences.

Beyond the call to live up to the teachings of the Church on the dignity of each and all persons, I think further challenges offered to us by the process of public school desegregation are the call to:

- examine ourselves not just as educators but as evangelists—*faith*ful men and women whose zeal leads them to carry the Gospel to minority people. To be effective, this process cannot be limited to children in a classroom but must go into the home and the community. The linkage should be obvious there.
- study and to develop methods of teaching that reach out to the minority student as a person with a culture to be respected and preserved. Too often we educate minority people to be "white;" we require that they adopt the culture of the majority instead of treasuring them and encouraging them to realize that one of the values we each bring to each other is our difference. Can we educate youngsters to develop the skills they need to function in our systems but still cultivate diverse cultural expression? Can we educate for a truly pluralistic society?
- evaluate the witness our Catholic schools give to the community in general and to plan for change in this service to our neighbor.

I do not expect that we will all jump on the bandwagon of desegregation. I do expect that the process of public school desegregation will lead you as Catholic educational leaders to face the deprivation of a racially isolated education as a preparation for life in today's and tomorrow's world, to make a priority the experiential in multi-racial and multi-cultural education to effectuate the life values taught in classrooms and to use all the influence you have in other church circles, as well as education circles, to help the Catholic Church in the United States be active and positive in eradicating racism from the institutions and systems that control our society.

If we believe in the equality of persons and their inherent right to equal opportunity to grow and develop in interdependence and cooperaton, then it is not enough for Catholics to prevent their schools from becoming havens for those escaping desegregation. We must prepare our people to respond in as many ways as possible with affirmative, practical measures to racially integrate our children's educational experience (and to do this creatively, not being afraid to let go of outmoded and ineffective structures, but to build new structures, and to employ new approaches) because it is best for our children, a support to the common good of our democracy, and true to our faith.

---

[1]Chancery Documents, Diocese of Cleveland, Prot. No. 59/1975.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Chancery Documents, Diocese of Cleveland, Prot. No. 59/1975.

[4]Ibid., Prot. No. 22/1976, March 16, 1976.

[5]Ibid.

[6]Ibid.

[7]Chancery Documents, *op. cit.*, Prot. No. 25/1977.

[8]Ibid.

[9]"A Plan for the Desegregation of the Cleveland Public Schools," Board of Education of the State of Ohio, January 17, 1977, p. 6, Table. 2

Highlighting the Conference: Discussions, Reflections, Responses

by Hope Brophy

The Washington conference was the third convened by NCCIJ on the Catholic Church and school desegregation. It was the first, however, on the desegregation of Catholic schools. Previous conferences (Columbus, Ohio in June 1976; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania in December 1976) concentrated on the Catholic Church response to public school desegregation.

Fifty registrants came from 14 States and the District of Columbia, with the largest representation from Ohio (5), Illinois (5) and the District of Columbia (5). With the exception of one delegate from Louisiana, all participants came from eastern and middle western states.

Most represented Catholic school systems, either as teachers or administrators. There were five diocesan superintendents of schools and several assistant superintendents. Diocesan social action commissions were represented, as were religious orders of men and women. The United States Catholic Conference sent two representatives, in addition to those staff members who gave formal presentations. There was representation from the National Catholic Education Association.

Four of the five major speakers came from education circles within the Catholic Church. Major papers are presented in full in this booklet. This paper will therefore focus primarily on ideas that emerged from workshops and informal discussions.

Conferees were divided into three discussion groups scheduled early the second day of the conference. Discussion was unstructured with a facilitator appointed for each group which formulated questions to be presented to an afternoon panel of reactors.

Those questions seemed to encompass all of the issues addressed during the remainder of the conference, leading one to suspect that the conferees came with specific concerns, that they were not distracted from those concerns to any appreciable degree throughout the conference.

Following is a synthesis of those questions, and of the responses made to them during any major session, workshop or informal discussion.

What is Our Goal and How Much Integration are We Talking About?

There seemed to be no disagreement as to the necessity for further integration of Catholic schools—it was a basic assumption. As John McDermott remarked in opening the conference, "We face it in a profound way, due to the value orientation of our schools." Awareness of the need was expressed variously. Dr. Robert Miller of Chicago put it, "I hear us saying that the motivation for desegregation is the morality of it."

Sister Frances Flanigan of Cleveland presented an overview of existing minority enrollment in Catholic schools in the United States. According to 1978 figures of NCEA, the number of minority (blacks, Spanish surname, Oriental) students enrolled in Catholic schools has increased by 67,000 since 1971, although total enrollment has gone down by one million students. Percentages of minority students has increased from 10.8 percent to 16 percent.

No one specifically answered the question of how much integration there should be although some participants seemed impatient to speak about and hear numbers.

A related question was raised: Who do we integrate first—student or staff? Mrs. Beverly Roberts, a member of the Chicago archdiocesan school board, advocated staff integration as the first step. Her advice was to "go right back home and add at least one minority person at a policy level." There is the possibility, however, that she took this direction because it was a practical step that most educators could envision, and because few specific integration tools were being suggested.

Are We Trying to Integrate Buildings or Are We Trying to Integrate Attitudes?

No one said that a choice should be made between the two courses of action. But there was considerably more discussion on the specifics of "integrating attitudes" than on the specifics of student enrollment.

Father David Sorohan, Superintendent of Catholic Schools in Columbus who presented a paper on a proposed pupil integration plan which would involve pairing a predominantly white with a predominantly minority Catholic school said, "Our primary concern is with attitudes, not moving bodies around." Mr. John McDermott noted that we can begin right away to integrate attitudes. "Much can be done on Monday morning."

Two workshops focused on ways to develop intercultural understanding. Betty Coles, Deputy Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, Brooklyn, New York, explained some of the helps available in devising good curriculum for schools with predominantly white enrollment. Among these curriculum aids are: The Cambridge *Monitoring Program Reading, Reading and Discovering, Science is Looking,* and *Science is Comparing.*

Sister Marina Herrara, Office of Education, USCC, sees Americans as victims of ethnocentrism—"The habitual disposition to judge alien peoples or groups by the standards and practices of one's own culture, with the accompanying tendency to view other cultures with disfavor."

She believes that the Catholic school system must take positive steps to develop multi-cultural awareness in all schools, no matter what the cultural mix,

and especially in all-white schools. Some suggested steps:

- Recognize cultural plurality as an asset in the schools and in society at large.
- Evaluate textbooks. If they are lacking in multi-cultural material, they can be supplemented; if they attack the cultural values of minorities, the books should be replaced.
- Make a commitment to use the cultural assets and skills of minority groups as a positive educational force.
- Require all students to learn at least two languages.
- Reflect the richness of diverse cultural groups in school celebrations and displays.

Sister Brigid Griffin and Sister Frances Flanigan, both from Cleveland, and Father Sorohan of Columbus all warned of the educational deprivation for all children caused by racial isolation. Their specific suggestions for school enrichment may be found in the texts of their papers above.

What Happens to Minority Students after They Are Enrolled in Our Schools?

Behind the many questions voiced on this general topic seemed to hover a doubt that the Catholic school system as it exists today is equipped to deliver quality education to a racially mixed group.

In one discussion group the question was asked, "Where will we get the empathetic teachers we'll need if we integrate?" The questioner cited, by way of comparison, the young "un-degreed nun" who taught in the Catholic schools during the heavy wave of immigration at the turn of the century, and who came from the same ethnic group as the student. This was part of a discussion on the historic role of Catholic schools in linking the Catholic subculture (the children of Catholic immigrants) to the mainstream of American society.

Two papers were presented on intercultural understanding. Father Joseph Fitzpatrick of Fordham University remarked, "We must look to the process of enabling minority children to become one with our society while remaining authentically themselves because, if they do not make it in the schools, they are not going to make it anywhere."

The Herrera workshop also outlined some recommendations for teachers and administrators in schools which have enrolled minority students. They should:

- recognize those elements that influence the learning process of the culturally and linguistically different and incorporate such elements in the curricula to insure a positive self-image toward academic motivations and achievement;
- hold as a major objective making the school truly belong to the people being served, rather than to the people who operate the school system;
- encourage teachers and administrators to gain the linguistic skills necessary for communication with students and parents of minority groups, and reward them for acquiring those skills.

Sister Boniface Adams, Assistant Superintendent of Schools for the diocese of Lafayette, Louisiana, said, "I'm impressed with the respect for cultural differences that I see here at this conference."

She warned against confusing myth with fact, however. "There are personal differences within any group, and much harm can be done by making a group more distinct than it really is.

"Let ethnic persons express their own ethnic characteristics. We must use discretion and delicacy in expressing ethnic culture in our schools."

Sister Boniface, who was active in two dioceses in the deep South when the "effort was made to integrate the Catholic school system," went on to say, "Now we are asking ourselves where all the black children went after we merged the Catholic schools. Many tried it and left. Why? They suffered hurts; they were ignored. They have escaped to public schools where they will probably suffer the same hurts."

This same judgment was made by a participant from Pennsylvania. "As blacks entered the predominately white schools," she said, "they were ignored, felt it was not the place to develop leadership, drifted back to all-black schools."

Is the Catholic School System Elitist?

There was general acceptance of the view that the voluntarism of the Catholic school system does result in a certain elitism, and that tuition costs serve as an indirect form of screening.

Beverly Roberts of Chicago cautioned the group against elitism. "I have had a lot of experience on Catholic school boards. I am a "black superior person," therefore I am not a threat to the Church. In our church efforts to integrate, we go after the best, those who do not threaten us. I urge you *not* to limit your efforts to superior blacks."

Sister Boniface: "I came to find an answer to the problem of exclusiveness attached to high tuition rates. How can we *keep* the children now in our schools?"

Father William Downey of Detroit spoke about the current method of financing Catholic schools, and the effect of this policy on integration goals and on elitism.

He said: "If we are serious about integrating Catholic schools, we must recognize that the current parish-by-parish existence in isolation is not workable. It serves to isolate the poor parish, which is often the site of the all-black school. What is needed is a new economic reorganization that calls for pooling resources so that we can eliminate the white elitism that creates a permanent underclass of blacks and other minorities."

Many Catholic Schools Are Now All-Black. Should They be Integrated?

According to NCEA figures distributed at the conference, the Catholic school system is, in the main, an urban system. In 1973-74, nearly half (46.7 percent) of the Catholic elementary schools, and over half (53.6 percent) of the secondary schools were within the limits of cities with a population of 50,000 or more.

Further, only 859 of the 2,358 schools that have closed or merged since 1967-68 were urban schools. Thus, urban schools are closing at a slower rate than schools in suburban or rural areas.

Since school enrollment tends to follow residential patterns, many core city Catholic schools are virtually all-black. Thus, the question of whether to establish as a goal the integration of all-black schools is a pertinent one in the Catholic school system.

Both sides of the question were aired.

Sister Frances Flanigan: "It must be remembered that many black parents and teachers believe that the black school is the best way in which to instill pride in black culture and black achievements."

Sister Boniface Adams: "In the combined schools, blacks do not have the authority they previously had in separate schools."

Another: "Blacks are saying, 'We don't really care where we go to school. We want quality education'."

Meyer Weinberg, Editor of *INTEGRATEDUCATION*, insisted that blacks are the strongest advocates of school desegregation. "Leadership in the movement has been black from the beginning. There are separatist sentiments in the black community, but you have to look very far and wide to find them." he said.

Betty Coles voiced opposition to the all-black school as psychologically destructive. "Show me the graduate from the all-black school fifteen years later," she said.

What about Church Leadership? Is School Integration a Priority?

As reflected in the formal presentations and the informal discussions of the conference, the answer is, "No. Catholic school integration is not a priority with Church leadership."

Sister Frances Flanigan quoted from major statements on racism made by the Catholic hierarchy, then added, "It is evident that the popes and bishops have spoken forcefully against racism and its attendant evils. However, the topic of racial isolation within the Catholic schools has not been mentioned."

The National "Call to Action" conference held in Detroit in October 1976 as part of the Catholic Church's Bicentennial celebration, attracted 1350 delegates and 1000 observers. A resolution adopted at the conference calls for "an active program of desegregation." NCCIJ was urged by the D.C. conference to monitor the implementation of the Detroit resolution.

Strong feeling was expressed about the role that NCEA and USCC ought to play in Catholic school desegregation. NCCIJ was urged to develop stronger ties with these agencies and to encourage immediate aggressive action at the policy level nationally. Conferees stated that local efforts are fragmented and suffered greatly from the absence of visible national leadership.

Sister Boniface Adams: "There are 25,000 educators at the NCEA convention every year. Let's get on that agenda with school desegregation." A similar appeal was voiced by Sister Mary Donovan of the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission. One educator called on NCEA to sponsor a national meeting of superintendents and principals of Catholic schools to examine possible models for Catholic school integration. Several expressed regret that there had not been greater representation of NCEA at the NCCIJ conference, and suggested that blacks and Hispanics should press for greater accountability from NCEA and USCC.

Beverly Roberts: "We should be able to say to NCEA: 'These are our goals. This is what we need from you.' We have to make them aware of our needs."

In one workshop, the question was asked, "Will leadership in desegregation come from the top or from the bottom?" The answer was, "It will come from the middle."

There were many references to what was perceived as the failure of the Church to educate its members at every level on the broad topic of social justice, particularly racial justice. Such comments reflected Sister Brigid Griffin's warning: "This [the need to examine Catholic schools] immediately produces a vision, at least for me, of the need to develop simultaneously a Catholic adult world that will not only understand and believe the faith as we teach it, but will support and encourage the application of Christian values to daily life."

Sister Brigid's paper alluded to some of the frustrating aspects of the question of Catholic leadership. She outlined "affirmative action recommendations" sent by Bishop James A. Hickey in May 1977 to all Catholic school principals in the Cleveland diocese.

The recommendations called for hiring minority teachers, curriculum revision, enrolling minority students. One year later, they "seem not to have altered the Cleveland Catholic schools in any visibly significant way," Sister Brigid said.

Regarding institutional (Catholic Church) racism, the following conference remarks were made:

"Our structure has tended to work for us in the past, but it may not work for us now. We have to spend some time looking at ourselves. We tend not to see ourselves as the enemy in this situation."

"Parishioners do not see the parish as the place to go with 'the problem'."

"We Catholics have a strong tradition of separatism. This works against us when we try to relate to the question of public school desegregation, and work toward peaceful implementation of court orders. This is especially true where parishes have not had a prior involvement in public school affairs."

"When the parish gets involved in public school desegregation, the CCD [Confraternity of Christian Doctrine] parents resent being singled out to bear this burden. True, it's their children who are being bused, but they feel that this is a moral issue that should be dealt with by the whole Church."

Participants described the various responses of Catholic leadership in those areas where public schools are under court order to desegregate. Much of that response centers around the posture of the Catholic school system toward those parents who seek to enroll their children in the Catholic system in order to avoid sending them to an integrated public school.

There was a conference tendency, more on the part of speakers and workshop presentors than conferees, to focus on the subject of Church response to public school desegregation. Obviously, both speakers and delegates had had more experience with public school desegregation than with Catholic school desegregation. Clear models for Catholic school desegregation have not emerged, and so there is little to talk about in the way of actual experience. "Suggestions" seemed thin, and generated little conversation.

How Do We Get from Discussion to Action?

This was probably the number one question at the conference, both spoken and unspoken. As Sister Gail Lambers, of the National Council of the Churches of Christ, put it: "I realized how heavy, old, complex an issue it is and how it affects the depths of our own persons."

Although the planners characterized the conference as "an invitation to ex-

plore models, share insights and experiences," few experiences in techniques of integration could be cited.

Frustration was expressed in a number of ways. Early in the conference, Msgr. John Ryan, Diocesan Superintendent of Schools, Buffalo, said privately, "I'm going to give it one more try. I've been to all of the conferences so far, and I want to know **HOW** to integrate our system. I'm willing."

Contacted after the conference, Msgr. Ryan indicated that the Washington conference took him a little bit further, but that there is a long way to go in developing workable techniques.

A kind of basic difference in approach was evident. Following are samples of responses to the above question:

Beverly Roberts: "I would like to take something concrete back to my school board. Let's take time to set goals. We should develop a plan for integrated education in our communities."

Vincent Golphin, Ethics teacher, Dayton, Ohio: "We just have to do it, one thing at a time. Don't shoot for the big things. Take the small steps."

Dr. Robert Miller, Diocesan Education Department, Chicago: "It's dangerous to intellectualize. Let's not stifle ourselves with plans of action that don't let us act."

Father Sorohan, whose paper was the most specific regarding desegregation plans (although not yet implemented), said in a workshop: "Dioceses are so diverse that a master strategy cannot be developed. We will push for pairing in the Columbus diocese."

Some obstacles to Catholic school integration were cited:

- Catholic schools have historically provided religion oriented education for Catholic children. Only six percent of the Nation's blacks are members of the Catholic Church.
- The voluntary nature of the Catholic schools. If the pastor of a parish cannot force students to attend the parish school, he obviously cannot compel attendance at another school.
- High financial costs might be incurred in desegregating, particularly if busing were involved. In one workshop information was exchanged on ways to raise money for scholarships for minority children who are poor. The group did not tackle the question of how to use scholarship money to recruit minority students, however.

Meyer Weinberg advocated a "diminution of voluntarism" in the Catholic school system saying that, in order to desegregate, Catholic schools must become less voluntary, and must explore some form of hookup with the public school system. Voluntary desegregation, in his opinion, produces only another form of tokenism.

In the last analysis, the Conference passed a resolution calling for each delegate to develop a plan that would generate a form of integrated education in his or her own diocese.

Minority Participation

Minority participation at the conference was almost exclusively black, although there was considerable attention to the interests of Hispanics in the presentations on intercultural understanding, as noted above.

Late the second day of the conference, a decision was made to delete the final planned session and to substitute a panel of black conferees, inviting them to comment on conference proceedings and to voice any concerns they might have about questions raised and opinions expressed at the conference. Panel members were:

Richard Dunbar—Office of Community Relations, Diocese of Toledo, Ohio
Beverly Roberts—Archdiocesan School Board, Chicago, Illinois
Vincent Golphin—Ethics Teacher, Carroll High School, Dayton, Ohio
Betty Coles—Deputy Superintendent of Schools, Brooklyn, New York
Sister Boniface Adams—Asst. Supt. of Schools, Diocese of Lafayette, Louisiana
Dr. Robert Miller—Department of Education, Diocese of Chicago

Many of their remarks are included above in response to specific questions raised during the conference.

The panel presentation as a whole conveyed a sense of urgency, a veiled fear that nothing much would happen although NCCIJ was commended for having arranged three conferences on school desegregation.

There was apparently some concern about the basic rationale for desegregation. As Richard Dunbar remarked, "Unfortunately we do not speak often of desegregation as a means to achieve quality education."

Dunbar also cautioned that blacks are needed in greater numbers in the move to desegregate Catholic schools. "They will need more than an invitation; they've been isolated for so long," he said.

Betty Coles expressed reservations about the tuition tax credit plan: "This conference seems to be saying that Catholic schools are superior. In fact, we have good and bad Catholic schools. Tuition tax credits will not cure the ills of the Catholic schools system. The system is resistant to change."

Conference Charge to NCCIJ

The conference commitment, as stated above, was to formulate a plan of action in each diocese represented. Conferees charged NCCIJ with certain administrative responsibilities that they felt would move the desegregation goal forward nationally:

- To convene future conferences, urging each diocese to send a team, since individuals alone cannot change systems.
- To serve as a clearinghouse for plans and techniques by means of a newsletter to all conferees and to other interested persons.
- To develop ongoing communication with NCEA and USCC on the subject of Catholic school desegregation, urging that the topic be placed on the agenda for future NCEA and USCC meetings.
- To attempt to influence the 1979 Bishops' statement on race in such a way that it will encourage the desegregation of Catholic schools.

The meeting concluded on an optimistic note, probably due to the vigor and sincerity of the individual commitments voiced during the final discussion. There seemed also to be a certain relief on the part of the participants that a charge had been made to NCEA and USCC, the two national policy making bodies, on matters educational as they apply to the Church.

Unfinished Business: School Desegregation

By Rev. Msgr. Aloysius J. Welsh, S.T.D.

There has been a dynamic at work in the school desegregation process since the historic U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) declared segregated education **inherently unconstitutional.** Desegregation itself works no miracles; integration itself is not an absolute value. Indeed, if integration of school populations means only the physical juxtaposition of students of diverse "race" or color, it is still compatible with second class, inadequate education. Desegregation can remove the complex problems the Supreme Court noted in 1954; only affirmative action programs providing faculty training, appropriate curricula and learning materials, and positive human relations, attitudes of administrations, faculties and parents can make possible a truly integrated education. To design and implement such programs should be a common goal for all educators of students of elementary and secondary school age. This is a moral imperative for both public and private non-profit school systems.

The National Catholic Conference For Interracial Justice (NCCIJ) renews its commitment in collaboration with the National Catholic Education Association and the Education Department, U.S. Catholic Conference, to participate in the common struggle to overcome inequalities in educational opportunity, and the discrimination persistent in educational activities.

These papers, published by the National Institute of Education, offer a variety of insights, and make valuable recommendations in the complex areas of the Catholic Community's response to school desegregation efforts in both public and Catholic schools. We are aware that these are small steps when giant strides are needed, and that they often raise questions whose answers lie only in the future cooperation of all educational agencies of good will. Our common concern is the child, multiplied by millions, whose educational progress must not be made impossible by discrimination and segregation, but made easy and effective by those who join to go the extra mile of commitment beyond court order and HEW initiatives.

Contributors

Sister Janet Brink, O.S.B., Associate Director, NCCIJ. Planned and coordinated this Conference.

Mrs. Hope Brophy, Board Member, NCCIJ, Grosse Point, Michigan. Summarized and highlighted the work of this conference.

Rev. Joseph P. Fitzpatrick, S.J., Ph.D., Professor of Sociology, Fordham University, New York.

Sister Frances Flanigan, H.M., Secretary of Education, Diocese of Cleveland.

Sister Brigid Griffin, C.S.J., Coordinator of Bishops Committee on School Desegregation.

Sister Gail Lambers, C.H.S., Staff Research and Administrative Assistant, National Council of Churches, Washington, D.C. Correlated and edited this publication.

Mr. John A. McDermott, Board Chairperson, NCCIJ, editor and publisher of the *Chicago Reporter*, a monthly information service on racial issues published by the Community Renewal Society.

Rev. David Sorohan, Superintendent of Schools, Diocese of Columbus.

Mr. Meyer Weinberg, Editor, *INTEGRATEDUCATION*, and Director, Center for Equal Education, now located at the School of Education, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Rev. Msgr. Aloysius J. Welsh, S.T.D., Executive Director, NCCIJ.

Resource Persons

Rev. Msgr. Frank Barrett
N.C.E.A.
1 Dupont Circle
Washington, D.C. 20036

Sister Cora Marie Billings
President, National Conference of Black Sisters
P.O. Box 28216
Philadelphia, Pa. 19131
(215) 473-8073

Mrs. Betty Coles
NCCIJ—Board Member
529 Champlain Avenue
West Hempstead, New York 11552

Rev. William Downey
St. Raymond Parish
20103 Joann
Detroit, Michigan 48205
(313) 527-0525

Rev. Patrick Farrell
United States Catholic Conference
Dept. of Education
1312 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 659-6600

Sister Marina Herrera
United States Catholic Conference
Dept. of Education
1312 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 659-6600

Ms. Linda Murray
NCCIJ—Research
1029 Vermont Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 638-0924

Ms. Marjorie Ragosta
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey
(609) 921-9000

Dr. Charles Thomas
Johns Hopkins University
Center for Social Organization of Schools
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
(301) 366-3582

Mary von Euler, Esq.
Desegregation Studies
National Institute of Education
1200 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20208
(202) 254-8897

Attendees

Sister Boniface Adams
Asst. Superintendent
Diocese of Lafayette
P.O. Drawer E
Lafayette, La. 70502
(504) 234-6358

Sister Patricia Andrews
Principal
15 Montebello Road
Jamaica Plain, Mass. 02130
(617) 524-0620

Sister Cornelia Boyle
Coordinator Secondary Education
Diocese of Washington, D.C.
717 Fifth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 737-3201

Rev. James Bretta
Our Lady of Lourdes Parish
1 Endicott Avenue
Revere, Massachusetts 02151

Rev. Stephen Brett
St. Joseph's Seminary Staff Member
1200 Varnum Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20017
(202) 526-4231

Mr. Francis Butler
Associate Secretary
Office of Domestic Social Development
United States Catholic Conference
1312 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 659-6804

Rev. John Carroll
Superintendent of Schools
Diocese of Paterson
777 Valley Road
Clifton, New Jersey 07013
(201) 777-8818

Dr. Leonard DeFiore
Superintendent of Schools
Diocese of Washington, D.C.
717 Fifth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 737-3201

Sister Mary D. Donovan
Pennsylvania Human Relations Commissioner
5320 Fifth Avenue, #101
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15232
(412) 681-0132

Sister Mary Pat Doolin
Dept. of Education
Diocese of Chicago
721 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60610
(312) 527-3200

Mr. Richard Dunbar
Community Relations Specialist
1933 Spielbusch Avenue
Toledo, Ohio 43624
(419) 248-2811

Rev. Richard Ehrens
Dept. of Education
Diocese of Chicago
721 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60610
(312) 527-3200

Sister Mary Catherine Eshenbach
Principal—St. Michael Archangel
3356 West 30th Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46222
(317) 926-0516

Sister Catherine Gilmore
Principal
29 Stanton Street
Dorchester, Massachusetts 02124
(617) 825-7955

Mr. Vincent Golphin
Teacher—Carroll High School
4520 Linden Avenue
Dayton, Ohio 45432
(513) 253-8188

Sister Michael Marie Griffin
Chairperson, Ursuline Social Justice Committee
3240 Fairmount
Cleveland, Ohio 44118
(216) 321-2157

Sister Veronica Grover
N.C.E.A.
Office of Peace and Justice
One Dupont Circle
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mr. Eugene Henderson
Executive Director
Community Affairs Office
5800 Weiss Avenue
Saginaw, Michigan 48603
(517) 755-7101

Sister Suzanne Hofweber
Superintendent of Schools
Diocese of Saginaw
2555 Wieneke Road
Saginaw, Michigan 48603

Dr. Patrick Hughes
Assistant Superintendent
100 South Elmwood Avenue
Buffalo, New York 14202
(716) 853-3775

Sister Miriam Kaeser
Principal—Saint Clare
5831 Sarnac
Cincinnati, Ohio 45224
(513) 541-5751

Sister Ellen Mary Kelly
Principal—St. Ann
2160 Stillman
Cleveland, Ohio 44118
(216) 932-4177

Rev. Peter Kenny, S.S.J.
1130 North Calvert Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202
(301) 727-3386

Mr. Bishop King
Dept. of Education
Diocese of Chicago
721 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60610
(312) 527-3200

Brother Richard Kiniry
Director of Education
Brothers of Holy Cross
P.O. Box 72
Riverside, Connecticut 06878
(203) 637-5457

Sr. Elizabeth Koszarek
Consultant for Special Services
345 North 95th Street
P.O. Box 2018
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201
(414) 476-2101

Mr. Richard Lacey
Long Island Catholic Interracial Council
P.O. Box 151
Garden City, New York 11550

Brother Bruce Lescher
Social Justice Coordinator
136 South Chapin Street
South Bend, Indiana 46625
(219) 288-0641

Rev. John Mahoney
Counselor
3875 Galaxie
St. Louis, Missouri 63034
(314) 381-7979

Sister George Manius, O.S.F.
Principal—St. Leo
3113 Brighton Road
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15212

Dr. Robert Miller
Dept. of Education
Diocese of Chicago
721 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60610
(312) 527-3200

Mrs. Beverly Roberts
Archdiocese of Chicago
211 East Chicago Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Rev. Msgr. John Ryan
Superintendent of School
100 South Elmwood Avenue
Buffalo, New York 14202
(716) 853, 3775

Sister Laura Jean Spaeth
Staff Member—Justice & Peace Center
3900 North 3rd Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53212
(414) 264-0800

Rev. Eugene Sullivan
Superintendent of Schools
468 Beacon Street
Boston, Mass. 02115
(617) 536-5417

Conference Program

Tuesday, May 16, 1978

Afternoon	**4:30**	Introduction: Mr. John McDermott, Chairperson, NCCIJ Remarks: Rev. Msgr. Frank Barrett, NCEA Rev. Patrick Farrell, USCC **Apostolate of Education** Bishop Eugene Marino, S.S.J., D.D. Auxiliary Bishop of Washington **Keynote Address:** *Catholic Schools and Racial Integration: A Journey Into The Future* Rev. Joseph P. Fitzpatrick, S.J., Ph.D. Fordham University
Evening	**8:00**	*Integration of Catholic Schools—What is Working? What is Possible?* Sr. Frances Flanigan, Secretary of Education, Diocese of Cleveland Rev. David Sorohan, Superintendent, Diocese of Columbus

Wednesday, May 17

Morning	**9:00**	Small Group Discussion—Rooms A-B-C (As assigned)
	10:45	Lessons from Public School Desegregation—Meyer Weinberg, Editor, *INTEGRATEDUCATION*, Northwestern University
Afternoon	**1:30**	*Panel*—Reacting to questions raised in small group discussions Sr. Cora Marie Billings, NCBS — Sr. Frances Flanigan Mr. John McDermott — Rev. David Sorohan
	3:00	Workshop Sessions Room A—*Curriculum in Predominantly White Schools*, Betty Coles, Dept. Superintendent of Schools, Brooklyn, New York Room B—*Multicultural Awareness*—Sister Marina Herrera, O.P., Office of Education, U.S.C.C. Room C—*Planning and Goal Setting*—Marjorie Ragosta, Educational Testing Services, Princeton, New Jersey
Liturgy	**4:45**	*Celebrant & Homilist* Room A—Rev. Patrick Farrell
Evening	**7:30**	Room A—*Update on Tuition Tax Credit* Rev. Patrick Farrell, U.S.C.C.
	8:15	*Can Parishes, Diocesan Human Relations Commissions and Schools Work Together?* Sr. Cora Marie Billings, Rev. William Downey, St. Raymond Parish, Detroit

Thursday, May 18

Morning	**8:00**	Liturgy—Room A Room A—*Celebrant*—Rev. Msgr. Frank Barrett, NCEA
	9:00	*Catholic Schools and Public School Desegregation* Sister Brigid Griffin, Comm. on Catholic Community Action, Diocese of Cleveland *Minority Input Panel*
	10:45	*Where Are We Going? What Are We Doing? Beginning the Journey.* Sister Gail Lambers, CHS Staff—National Council of Churches

☆U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1979-625-699/1391-31